

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

VOL. XXV.

BALTIMORE, APRIL, 1910.

No. 4.

DOPPELDRUCKE VON SCHILLERS JUNGFRAU VON ORLEANS.

I. *Kalender auf das Jahr 1802.*

Schillers *Jungfrau von Orleans* erschien bekanntlich im Herbst des Jahres 1801 unter dem Titel: KALENDER / AUF DAS JAHR 1802. / DIE / JUNGFRAU VON ORLEANS. / EINE ROMANTISCHE TRAGÖDIE / VON / SCHILLER. / (Kalenderstempel) / BERLIN. / BEI JOHANN FRIEDRICH UNGER.

Dass von dieser Ausgabe zwei Doppeldrucke existieren, ist schon lange bekannt, das genauere Verhältnis derselben zu einander ist jedoch bisher noch nicht definitiv dargestellt worden. Trömel (*Schillerbibliothek* 177) hält den Druck mit den Lesarten *Throne* (S. 12. Z. 2), *wunderbare* (S. 25. Z. 14), *Stahl* (S. 160. Z. 20) für den ersten, während Vollmer, (*Historisch-kritische Ausgabe* Bd. 13. S. ix.) den Druck mit den Lesarten *Stuhle*, *wundervolle*, *Strahl* u. s. w., den er mit A bezeichnet, für den früheren und ächten erklärt, indem er noch hinzufügt: "*Schiller hat keinen Theil an dem Druck B (mit den oben angeführten Lesarten Throne u. s. w.), dieser ist für die Textkritik ohne irgend welchen Belang.*"

Die Gründe für Vollmers Urteil sollen später erörtert werden, vorerst wollen wir uns einer ausführlichen Beschreibung der beiden Drucke unterziehen. Äusserlich stimmen sie genau überein: beide bestehen aus Titelpuffer, Titel, 14 Bll. Kalender, 260 SS. (Text der *Jungfrau*), 37 Bll. "Genealogie der regierenden hohen Häupter und anderer fürstlichen Personen in Europa." Dazu kommt noch in A ein Blatt Verlagsanzeigen zur Michaelis-Messe 1801.

Das Format ist 12°. Der Titel ist besonders gedruckt. Die Bogen A—L bestehen aus je 12 Bll., während M, den Schluss des Textes des *Jungfrau* enthaltend, nur 10 Bll. aufweist. Der Satz dieser Bogen wurde in solcher Weise in die Form gebracht, dass beim Binden aus jedem

Bogen zwei Hefte von je 8 und 4 Bll. wurden (Bogen M: 6 u. 4). Die Bogen N—T dagegen, welche die Genealogie enthalten, bestehen abwechselnd aus 8 und 4 Bll., nur Bogen T, als letzter, besteht im Drucke B aus einem einzelnen Blatte, im Drucke A aus einem Doppelblatte, da hier noch die Verlagsanzeige hinzukommt. Bogen A enthält den Kalender, der mit dem zweiten Blatte des Bogens B schliesst. Dieser besteht anscheinend aus 14 Bll., doch sind zwei derselben (Untertitel u. Personen), als Kartons eingefügt. Der eigentliche Text der *Jungfrau* erstreckt sich vom 3. Blatte des Bogens B bis zum Schluss des Bogens M, während N—T, wie schon bemerkt, die Genealogie enthalten.

Es drängt sich nun die Frage auf, ob die Drucke A und B von demselben Satze abgezogen sind. Falls diese Frage bejaht werden kann, so ist man zu dem Schlusse berechtigt, dass der korrektere Druck der spätere sei, indem die ursprünglichen Druckfehler bemerkt und aus dem für den zweiten Druck stehengebliebenen Satz entfernt wurden. Falls jedoch in dem einen oder dem anderen Drucke neuer Satz vorliegt, braucht es anderer Beweise, um über die Priorität zu entscheiden. Im Folgenden wird meistens von der Anführung der eigentlichen Textvarianten abgesehen, da diese hier nicht von grossem Belang sind.

Im Titel lassen sich keine Unterschiede bemerken, und auch Bogen A ist von demselben Satz abgezogen: vgl. das Wort *Erscheinung* im Russischen Kalender (7. May): in beiden Drucken stehen die Buchstaben *ng* etwa einen halben mm. über der Zeile. Bogen B dagegen ist in einem der Drucke neugesetzt, wie z. B. auf der letzten Seite des Kalenders leicht zu erkennen ist, wenn man *Morgens*, Z. 13, mit dem darüberstehenden *Sie* vergleicht. Ferner sind zu vergleichen: *schlungen*, S. 8, Z. 5; *schweigen*, S. 13, Z. 14; *Westfriesland*, S. 19, Z. 5, dessen letzte Silbe in B eine besondere Zeile einnimmt; nach dem Worte *halten*, S. 21, Z. 13, hat A einen Punkt, B dagegen ein Komma.

Die Bogen C—H sind gleichfalls neu gesetzt.

Für Bogen CDE ist dies am leichtesten zu erkennen an den Stellen *Alle*, S. 27, Z. 17; *ich*, S. 31, Z. 9; Fussnote S. 33; *nachdem*, S. 50, Z. 4; *Gnug*, S. 53, Z. 16; *Dünois*, S. 65, Z. 16; *find*, S. 74, Z. 4; *Chatillon*, S. 91, Z. 13. In Bogen F finden sich eine Anzahl Lesarten die nicht von Vollmer vermerkt sind: S. 104, Z. 5 hat A den Druckfehler *eineu*; desgleichen auf S. 107, Z. 5. ZWEITFR; Z. 15 dagegen hat B *Banden*, anstatt *Bande*. Man vergleiche ferner *Herz*, S. 113, Z. 12; auf S. 120 fehlt in B der Kustos *Jo-*. In Bogen G ist das G selbst zu vergleichen, S. 121, desgleichen G₂ auf S. 123; ferner *Befitz' ich*, S. 125, Z. 17; *tritt zwischen*, S. 141, Z. 5. In Bogen H: *dieser bleibt*, S. 145, Z. 4; *nach*, S. 149, Z. 5; *Wären*, S. 162, Z. 15. Auf S. 155, Z. 10 fehlt in einem Exemplare von A die Interpunktion, in einem anderen dagegen, sowie in B, steht der Strich. S. 157, Z. 5 hat A *wollt entrüsten*, B dagegen *wollt entrüsten*.

Bogen I ist von demselben Satz abgezogen: vgl. das *EL* von *LIONEL*, S. 172, Z. 9; das *v* von *verbirgt*, S. 174, Z. 13, ist in beiden Drucken schadhaft; das *Z* in *AUFZUG*, S. 180, Z. 1, steht in beiden über der Zeile; auf S. 183, Z. 5, haben beide *ich* anstatt *ich*; zwar findet sich auch auf S. 188, Z. 21, ein kleiner Unterschied, indem A *Erde!* liest, während in B die Interpunktion ausgefallen ist, zweifellos nur aus Zufall. S. 189, Z. 19, ist das *i* in *dich* in beiden Drucken ohne Punkt; ähnlich ist auf S. 192, Z. 14, das *w* in *will* defekt.

Bogen K ist wieder neu gesetzt: man vergleiche das *K* selbst; auf Z. 195, Z. 2, fehlt in A der Punkt hinter *Krönungsmarsch* (Vollmer liest hier *Krönungsmarsch* AB, aber mit Unrecht). Auf S. 204 ist der neue Satz deutlich zu erkennen an den Stellen *Fahne*, *Volk*, Z. 5, und *Kirche*, Z. 9. Auf S. 208, Z. 17 hat B richtig *bleiben*, A dagegen *bleiben*, und nach *stehen* hat A einen Punkt, während in B die Interpunktion fehlt; Z. 19 hat B den Druckfehler *Betrand*. Auf S. 209 sind die ersten drei Zeilen deutlich als neugesetzt zu erkennen; S. 212, Z. 4, hat B den Druckfehler *Dnrch's*, während dagegen Z. 12 A den Druckfehler *Es* anstatt *Es* aufweist. Die sämtlichen hier mitgeteilten Varianten dieses Bogens fehlen bei Vollmer.

Die Bogen LM sind von demselben Satze abge-

zogen: S. 218, Z. 15, findet sich in beiden Drucken *and* anstatt *und*, während Z. 18 dies Wort als *und* erscheint. Dagegen hat A allein die falsche Seitenzahl 119 anstatt 219, wonach also B der spätere Druck wäre; S. 219, Z. 9 hat A ein verkehrtes Semikolon, welches in B richtig steht. Auf S. 228, Z. 7, fehlt in beiden Drucken der Punkt des *i* in *Raimond*; desgleichen ist Z. 12 das *Z* in *Zauberin* schadhaft; S. 229, Z. 18, ist das erste *i* in *reinigen* in beiden Drucken ohne Punkt; S. 232, Z. 16, ist das *ü* in *zurück* schadhaft. Für Bogen M ist zu vergleichen S. 248, Z. 17, wo dem *i* in *einem* der Punkt fehlt; S. 257, Z. 4, steht der letzte Buchstabe des Wortes *BURGUND* über der Zeile, während Z. 7 das *N* in *AGNES* unter der Zeile steht; S. 260, Z. 11, fehlt dem *i* in *Flügelkleide* der Punkt.

Die ganze Genealogie (Bogen N—T) ist ebenfalls von demselben Satze abgezogen, trotz der zahlreichen später zu besprechenden Varianten, die also auf Korrekturen im stehengebliebenen Satze zurückgehen. Dies wird durch die vielen gemeinsamen Druckfehler, schadhaften Lettern u. dgl. über allen Zweifel zur Gewissheit erhoben. Wo nicht ausdrücklich das Gegenteil bemerkt wird, gelten folgende Angaben für beide Drucke:

Blatt N, recto, Z. 15, ist das Komma hinter *Adlerordens* verkehrt und unter der Zeile; unter der Rubrik *Anhalt-Bernburg-Schaumburg-Hoym*, Z. 6, ist das Wort *mit* beinahe unkenntlich; unter *Anhalt-Zerbst*, Z. 5, ist die Silbe *An* in *Anhalt-Bernburg* unter der Zeile; unter *Baden*, Z. 29, steht *Christiane Luise*. In Bogen O, unter *Fulda*, steht der Druckfehler *bestäud*. *Erzkanzler*; unter *Hessen-Cassel*, Z. 8, fehlt der Punkt am *i* des Wortes *Königs*, sowie auch in dem Worte *Cavallerie* auf der letzten Zeile derselben Seite. In Bogen P, Z. 2 der ersten Seite, ist das *r* in *Eleonore* gebrochen; Bl. P, recto, 7. Z. von unten, ist das erste *r* in *Frhrn. Hanno* gebrochen; auf der letzten Zeile der Rückseite dieses Blattes hat zwar B allein *Philipps eich*, doch hat dieser aus Zufall entstandene Fehler nichts zu bedeuten.

In Bogen Q, unter der Rubrik *Oettingen-Spielberg*, Z. 22, ist das erste *n* in *Johann* in beiden Drucken gebrochen; in der ersten Zeile der folgenden Seite vergleiche man *Phil. Carl*, und in der fünften Zeile das Schadhafte *u* in *Eugen*. In Bogen R, unter *Rosenberg*, steht in der dritten

Zeile *s*, *Vetter* anstatt *s. Vetter*; auf der nächsten Seite, Z. 3, fehlt die untere Hälfte des *J* in *Jul. 1769*; Z. 20 steht *verm mit Paul* anstatt *verm. mit Paul*; unter *Schwarzenberg*, Z. 4, steht *geb. 27. Juni* anstatt *geb. 27. Juni*. In Bogen S, unter *Sicilien und Neapolis*, Z. 2, steht das *t* in *Katholischer* etwas unter der Zeile; unter *Solms-Braunfels*, Z. 10 von unten, ist das *r* in *Herzogs* ausgefallen; unter *Spanien*, Z. 17, ist das *W* in *Wittwer* schadhaft. In Bogen T, letzte Seite, Z. 1, steht *Charlotte* anstatt *Charlotte*.

Diese den beiden Drucken gemeinsamen Merkmale beweisen unumstößlich dass die Genealogie von demselben Satze abgezogen ist. Um also die Hauptpunkte zusammenzufassen: Der Kalender (Bogen A u. 3 SS. von B) ist von demselben Satze; der zweite Teil von B und die Bogen C—H sind neu gesetzt; Bogen I ist von demselben Satz; Bogen K ist neu gesetzt; Bogen L—T sind von demselben Satze.

Wir schreiten nun zur Besprechung der textlichen Abweichungen in der Genealogie. Hier kommen neun Stellen in Betracht:

- 1.) Auf der letzten Seite des Bogens N findet sich in *B* die Rubrik:

Cöln.

Ist erledigt.

In *A* dagegen wird Cöln nicht angeführt.

- 2.) Unter der Rubrik *Deutschmeister* findet sich in *A*:

Maximilian Franz, Erzherzog von Oesterreich, Großmeister, geb. 8. Dec. 1756, erw. als Coadjut. zum Deutschmeister im Oct. 1769.

Dagegen verzeichnet *B*:

Karl Ludwig, Erzherzog von Oesterreich, Großmeister s. 26. Jul. 1801. Siehe Oesterreich.

- 3.) Auf Blatt O₂ verso hat *A* die Rubrik:

Florenz, s. Toscana.

In *B* fehlt dieselbe.

- 4.) Auf Blatt Q₂ recto hat *A* die Rubrik:

Münster, s. Cöln.

Dagegen steht in *B*:

Münster.

Ist erledigt.

- 5.) Unter der Rubrik *Oesterreich-Lothringen* wird in *A* der älteste Bruder des Kaisers angeführt als:

2. Ferdinand III. Joseph Joh. Baptist, Großherzog von Toscana, s. Toscana. (2 Zeilen).

In *B* dagegen fehlt der Hinweis auf Toscana, wobei durch die Aufzählung der Familie des Grossherzogs der Abschnitt 8 Zeilen einnimmt, anstatt zwei:

2. Ferdinand Joseph Joh. Baptist, Erz- und Großherzog, geb. 6. Mai 1769, verm. 19. Sept. 1790 mit Luise Marie Amalie Therese, Tochter des Kön. Ferdinand IV. von Sicilien und Neapel, geb. 27. Jul. 1773. Davon . .

- 6.) Unter der Rubrik *Parma und Piacenza* beschreibt *A* den ältesten Sohn des regierenden Herzogs als:

1. Ludwig, Erbprinz, geb. 5. Jul. 1773. verm. 25. Aug. 1795 mit Marie Luise Josephe, Infantinn von Spanien, geb. 6. Jul. 1782. Davon: Ein Prinz geb. 23. Dec. 1799.

In *B* dagegen heisst der älteste Sohn:

1. Der König von Toskana. (ohne weitere Angaben).

- 7.) Unter der Rubrik *Sicilien und Neapolis* nennt *A* das dritte Kind des Königspaares:

3. Die Großherzogin von Toscana.

In *B* dagegen heisst sie:

3. Die Gemalin des Erz- und Großherzogs Ferdinand, Bruders des röm. Kaisers Franz 2.

- 8.) Unter der Rubrik *Spanien* steht in *A* als drittes Kind:

3. Die Erbprinzessin von Parma.

In *B* erscheint diese Prinzessin als

3. Die Königin von Toskana.

- 9.) Die Rubrik *Toskana* lautet in *A*:

Großherzog.

Ferdinand III. Joseph Johann Baptist, geb. 6. May 1769, K. K. Prinz, Erzherzog von Oesterreich, K. K. Gen. L. succ s. Vater Leop. II. 20. März 1790, verm. 19. Sept. 1790 mit Luise Marie Amalie Therese, Tochter des Königs Ferd. IV. von Sicilien und Neapel, geb. 27. Juli 1773.

Kinder.

1. Leopold Johann Joseph, Erbprinz, geb. 3. Oct. 1797.

2. Karol. Ferd. Therese Luise Joh. Jos., geb. 2. Aug. 1793.

3. Marie Luise Joh. Jos. Karol. Rose, geb. 30. August 1798.

4. Therese Franziske Jos. Joh. Bened., geb. 21. März 1801.

Anstatt dessen heisst es in *B*:

König.

Ludwig I. geb. 5. Jul. 1778. verm. 25. Aug. 1795 mit Marie Luise Josephe, Infantin von Spanien, geb. 6. Jul. 1782.

Der Kronprinz, geb. 23. Dec. 1799,

Bei näherer Betrachtung erhellt dass die eben angeführten Stellen sich auf zwei Ereignisse beziehen :

- a) den Dynastiewechsel in Toscana, (Nn. 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9),
- b) den Tod des Erzherzogs Maximilian Franz (Nn. 1, 2, 4).

Vollmer hat nur drei dieser Stellen bemerkt (Nn. 6, 8, 9) vermittelt welcher er die Priorität von A feststellt. Der Gang seiner Beweisführung ist folgender :

„ Die Einsetzung des Erbprinzen Ludwig von Parma zum König von Etrurien an Stelle Ferdinands III. erfolgte am 21. März 1801, und es geht daraus mit unumstösslicher Gewissheit hervor, dass A, mit der alten Ordnung der Dinge, früher, B aber, das jene dynastische Veränderung aufzeichnet, später gedruckt ist.“

Dabei lässt Vollmer jedoch ausser Acht, dass Schiller das Manuskript der Jungfrau erst am 23. bezw. 30. April an Unger schickte, und dass folglich der Satz kaum vor Anfang Mai begonnen werden konnte. Auch finden sich in beiden Drucken mehrere Ereignisse verzeichnet, die nach dem 21. März stattfanden. So z. B. unter Malta und Russland der Tod des Kaisers Paul I., am 24. März, 1801 ; unter Schweden die Geburt der Prinzessin Sophie Wilhelmine am 21. Mai, 1801 ; unter Schwarzburg-Rudolstadt die Geburt der Zwillinge Bernhard und Rudolph, „ im Juli 1801.“¹ Unter diesen Umständen kann also die Tatsache dass A den Dynastiewechsel vom 21. März nicht verzeichnet, nicht zur Zeitbestimmung gebraucht werden, indem ja auch Tendenz mit im Spiele sein könnte : der erste Druck des Gotha'schen Kalenders für 1808, z. B., wurde auf Befehl Napoleons unterdrückt und durch einen neuen ersetzt.²

Die Sache lässt sich jedoch ganz einfach erklären, da das von Vollmer angenommene Datum falsch ist. Seit März 1799 war Ferdinand III. von Toscana flüchtig gewesen, da das Land von französischen

Truppen besetzt war. In dem Vertrag von Lunéville, 9. Feb. 1801, gab er seine Ansprüche auf Toscana zu Gunsten des Herzogs von Parma auf, unter der Bedingung : „ Der Grossherzog wird in Teutschland eine vollständige Entschädigung für seine italienischen Staaten erhalten.“ Die Sache wurde also künftiger Vereinbarung überlassen, doch die Franzosen blieben nach wie vor im Besitz Toscanas. Im Vertrage von Madrid, 21. März 1801, wurden dann zwischen Frankreich und Spanien die Bedingungen festgesetzt, unter denen Toscana dem Hause Bourbon überlassen werden sollte, aber die förmliche Besitzergreifung fand erst im August statt. Am Zweiten dieses Monats erschien der Marquis Cesar Ventura in Florenz, um als Bevollmächtigter des neuen Königs von Etrurien die Huldigung der Behörden zu empfangen, und zehn Tage später erschien der König selber. Am 23. August wurde die vorige Regierung aufgelöst, indem gleichzeitig ein neues Ministerium ernannt wurde.³

Anstatt des 21. März erhalten wir also das Datum 2.-12.-23. August. Der Druck A war also schon fertig, als diese Nachricht nach Berlin gelangte. In dem stehengebliebenen Satz wurden dann die betreffenden Stellen korrigiert, um davon später den Druck B abzuziehen. Dies kann nämlich an dem Satze selbst bewiesen werden, ganz abgesehen von dem Inhalt. Gewöhnlich misst nämlich die Druckseite in AB 95 oder 96 mm. Höhe. So auch in A diejenigen drei Seiten, auf welche die Rubrik Oesterreich-Lothringen verteilt ist. In B dagegen sind die betreffenden Seiten 100 bezw. 101 mm. hoch, da in dieser Rubrik sechs neue Zeilen hinzukamen, deren je zwei auf die vorhergehende und nachfolgende Seite verteilt wurden, weshalb diese drei Seiten je 5 mm. grösser sind als die entsprechenden Seiten von A.

Es erübrigt noch, die drei Stellen unter Cöln, Deutschmeister und Münster zu besprechen. Maximilian Franz, jüngster Sohn Maria Theresiens, war nicht nur Deutschmeister, sondern auch Bischof von Münster und Kurfürst von Cöln. Durch seinen Tod wurden also das Bistum Münster und das Erzbistum Cöln erledigt, wie auch B angibt. Das Amt eines Deutschmeisters wurde

¹ Nach dem Gothaer Almanach für 1810 wurde Prinz Bernhard am 23. Juni geboren, doch spielt dies Datum hier keine Rolle.

² Fromm, *Napoleon und der Gothaer Almanach*, Zeitschrift für Bücherfreunde, I (1897), Heft 8.

³ Reumont, *Geschichte Toscana's*, II. S. 402-405, wo alle Einzelheiten genau angegeben sind.

jedoch nicht erledigt, da Maximilian Franz es schon am 6. Juni durchgesetzt hatte, dass sein Neffe Erzherzog Karl Ludwig, der spätere Sieger bei Aspern, zu seinem Coadjutor gewählt wurde. Als dann Maximilian Franz am 27. Juli⁴ kurz nach Mitternacht starb, war Karl Ludwig ipso facto Deutschmeister.

In dieser Beziehung ist zu Bemerken, dass sowohl in A wie in B der Erzherzog Maximilian Franz unter der Rubrik Oesterreich-Lothringen nicht mehr erwähnt wird. Im Unger'schen *Militärischen Kalender auf das Jahr 1802* dagegen, dessen Genealogie sonst genau mit A übereinstimmt, wird Maximilian Franz noch unter den *Onkels und Tanten* des Kaisers angeführt. Daraus folgt also, dass Bogen Q des Druckes A gleichfalls erst nach dem Tode des Erzherzogs gedruckt wurde. Warum dagegen die Rubrik Cöln in A gar nicht erwähnt werden sollte ist mir unerklärlich. Denn unter den Rubriken Mergentheim (dies war der Sitz der Verwaltung des Deutschordens) und Münster heisst es noch *s. Cöln*.

Aus dem Vorhergehenden lassen sich also folgende Daten feststellen :

- a) Bogen R der beiden Drucke ist erst nach Anfang Juli gedruckt (vgl. Schwarzburg-Rudolstadt).
- b) Die Bogen OPQ (*Deutschmeister, Münster*) des Druckes A wurden ca. Ende Juli gedruckt ; im stehengebliebenen Satz wurden dann die betreffenden Stellen für den Druck B korrigiert.
- c) Bogen Q der Drucke AB wurde nach dem 27. Juli gedruckt, da der Erzherzog Maximilian unter Oesterreich-Lothringen nicht mehr erwähnt wird.
- d) Die Bogen OPQS (*Florenz, Oesterreich-Lothringen, Parma, Sicilien, Spanien, Toskana*) des Druckes A wurden vor Mitte August gedruckt, dagegen sind die betreffenden Bogen von B später. Da der letzte Bogen T nur aus einem einzigen Blatte besteht, so kam man sagen dass die ganze Genealogie von A

zwischen Anfang Juli und Mitte August 1801 gesetzt wurde. Am 15. Oktober erhielt Schiller zwölf Exemplare des Kalenders, wovon er in den nächsten Tagen gleich die Mehrzahl verteilte, und zwar an den Herzog, die Herzogin, die Prinzess (Caroline Luise), die Herzogin Mutter, Goethe, Meier, Wieland, Körner—Letzterem zwei Exemplare.

Aus der Priorität des Kalenders von A dürfen wir auch schliessen dass der Text dieses Druckes der frühere sei. Man könnte zwar einwenden, dass der frühere Druck des Textes eventuell mit dem späteren Druck des Kalenders verbunden worden sei. Dieser Annahme widerspricht aber das in den beiden Drucken benutzte Papier. Für A wurde nämlich durchweg geripptes Papier gebraucht, in welchem die Filigrane deutlich zu erkennen sind. In meinem Exemplare ist in den Bogen A—N der Name *I. G. EBART* zu lesen, während die Bogen O—T abwechselnd die Initialen *HR* und *GR* aufweisen—zu den grösseren Bogen der Genealogie (8 Bll.) wurde jedesmal das mit *GR* bezeichnete Papier gebraucht, zu den kleineren (4 Bll.) das Papier mit den Buchstaben *HR*. Alle Exemplare werden wohl hierin nicht genau übereinstimmen—eine Dublette in meinem Besitz weist z. B. auch in Bogen O das Ebart'sche Papier auf—doch bestehen die bis jetzt eingesehenen Exemplare sämtlich aus geripptem Papier mit Filigranen.

Dagegen ist B durchweg auf Druckpapier gedruckt, welches nirgends Wasserlinien aufweist. Es folgt hieraus, dass sowohl A als B als Einheiten gedruckt wurden. Es können ja auch Mischexemplare vorhanden sein — die oben erwähnte Dublette z. B., welche aus Goedekes Besitz stammt, besteht mit Ausnahme von Bogen D aus geripptem Papier : dieser Bogen, und er allein, weist nun auch die Lesarten von B auf.

Das gesamte Beweismaterial spricht also für die Priorität von A : nur ein einziger Einwand ist noch zu beseitigen. In dem Auktionskatalog der Bibliothek Deneke (J. Baer & Co., 1909) wird bemerkt dass A (No. 796) den Kalenderstempel mit dem Datum 1802 trage, während der Stempel in B (No. 797) die Jahreszahl 1801 aufweise. Hiermit stimmen auch die von mir eingesehenen Exemplare überein. Es lässt sich darauf nur entgegnen, dass wir vorläufig nichts über die Art

⁴C. v. Wurzbach, *Biographisches Lexikon des Kaiserthums Oesterreich*, gibt dies Datum als 26. August, 1801, doch ist dies augenscheinlich ein Irrtum. Vgl. den ausführlichen Bericht in der *Allgemeinen Deutschen Biographie*.

und Weise der Abstempelung wissen. Es konnte ja leicht vorkommen, dass in dem einen Falle der Stempel des laufenden Jahres (1801), in dem anderen der Stempel des auf dem Titel angegebenen Jahres gebraucht wurde. Der Stempel des oben erwähnten *Militärischen Kalenders auf das Jahr 1802*, dessen Genealogie noch früher als *W* gedruckt wurde, zeigt ein Datum welches entweder als 1802 oder 1804 zu entziffern ist. In dem gleichfalls von Unger herausgegebenen *Berlinischen Damenkalender auf das Jahr 1803* ist sowohl Titel als Kalenderstempel (1803) gestochen, und zwar höchst wahrscheinlich auf derselben Platte.

Das Datum des Kalenderstempels hat also gegen die Priorität von *W* kein grosses Gewicht. Wir werden demnach die Lesarten *Herabfenkt* (Z. 100), *Stuhle* (Z. 142), *wundervolle* (Z. 421), *Strahl* (Z. 3042) u. s. w. als die Schillerschen anerkennen müssen, während *Herablenkt*, *Throne*, *wunderbare*, *Stahl* u. s. w. nur durch die Flüchtigkeit des Setzers von *B* in den Text gekommen sind.

W. KURRELMAYER.

Johns Hopkins University.

THE MAGIC BALM OF GERBERT AND FIERABRAS, AND A QUERY.

Gerbert, one of the "continuator" of Crestien de Troyes's unfinished *Perceval, ou le Conte du Graal*, appears to have borrowed in one place from the Charlemagne romance of *Fierabras*. Gerbert is describing how Perceval, lying at night on a field where he has annihilated his host of enemies, sees a Hideous Hag approach and with a balm begin to restore his enemies to life:

"Diex! fait il, de quel vix malfex
Vient ore si laide figure?"

Cette sorcière tient à la main:

.II. barisiax d'ivoire gent;
Li cercle ne sont pas d'argent,
Mais de fin or cler et vermeil.

Elle y conserve un philtre, "une poison," qui a servi au Christ dans le sépulcre et qui sert dans les mains de la sorcière à ressusciter les morts et à "rejoindre" les têtes coupées:

A la teste maintenant prise,
Si l'a desor le bu assise;

Elle prend du baume:

Puis en froire celui la bouche
À cui la teste avoit rajointe;
Sor celui n'ot vaine ne jointe
Qui lues ne fust de vie plaine!
N'avoit plaie qui ne fust saine
Ausi que s'aine ne fust blechiez;
Plus tost est en estant drechiez
Que on ne péust dire trois.
À la poison fu li otrois
Donez qu'ele fait morz revivre;
Car Dieu, qui ses amis delivre
D'infier et chiax qu'il a mez,
En fu oinz et embalsemez
Quant el sépulcre fu couchiez.
—À .IIII. en a remis les chiés
La vielle et rendue la vie. . .

Perceval, Potvin's ed., vi, 183 ff.

In *Fierabras* Oliver, badly wounded, issues from camp to do single combat against the heathen giant Fierabras, who, perceiving Oliver's wounded condition, generously offers to heal him:

"—Certes, dist Fierabras, [Oliver,] vous [i] mentés,
Car li sans vous a ja les jenous surmontés;
Tu es el cors navrés, je le sai de vertés.
Mais voilà .II. barils à ma sele toursés,
Qui tuit sunt plain de basme dont Dius fu enbasmés
Au jour qu'il fu de crois el sepucere portés;
Plaie qui en est ointe, c'est fine verités,
Ne puet estre percie ne en drangle mellés:
Maintenant est li hons garis et repassés.
Je le conquis à Romme, ki est vostre cités.
Or va, si pren du basme tout à ta volenté,
Ja seras maintenant garis et respasés,
Puis te combattras mieus encontre moi assés."

Fierabras, Kroeber and Servois, p. 17, vv. 522-534.

The idea of putting a revivifying balm in two little barrels and then connecting it with the Resurrection of Christ is not one likely to have occurred independently to two writers. That Gerbert borrowed this idea, or description, from *Fierabras* is a wholly reasonable assumption. He wrote from thirty to sixty years after the date (c. 1170) assigned to *Fierabras*; the Hideous Hag, the balm itself, and all the other incidents surrounding them are in Gerbert's source¹; and, if he is the same as the Gerbert who wrote the

¹To the same source are indebted the English *Sir Perceval of Galles* and the Welsh *Peredur*; cf. a detailed study in a volume I purpose to print shortly, in which I hope to do much to reconstruct the story.

Roman de la Violette, his reading was so wide² as almost certainly to have included the *Fierabras*.

A magic balm for reviving the dead or for curing wounds immediately is not infrequently mentioned in early tales. A tentative list of occurrences may be worth giving:

Erec, 4216-36, a balm sent to Arthur by his sister Morgue.

Yvain, 2952 ff., sent by Morgain the Wise to the Lady of Norioison.

The Mabinogion: "Lady of the Fountain," "Geraint" (?).

Ywain and Wawain, 1750 ff.

Fierabras, Gerbert, as above.

Morte Arthure, see note 4, below.

Malory's *Morte D'Arthur*, Bk. v, Ch. x; Bk. vii, Ch. xxii.

The Mummers', or *St. George*, plays; for bibliog. cf. E. K. Chambers, *The Mediæval Stage*, I, 205 f.

J. F. Campbell, *Popular Tales of the West Highlands* (ed. 1890-93), "Knight of the Red Shield," "Conal Gulban," etc.; see Index.

J. Macdougall, *Folk and Hero Tales from Argyllshire*, "Lad of the Skin Coverings;" see Index.

Hertz, in a note to his *Parzival*, mentions:

Turin, *Vengeance*, I, II, 14, fol. 80vo.

Rigomer (*Hist. Litt. d. l. Fr.*, xxx, 92).

Arthur Beatty, "The St. George, or Mummers' Plays" (*Transac. Wisconsin Acad. Sc., Arts, and Let.*, xv, 283, Oct., 1906), mentions an occurrence, not otherwise known to me, in a German play of the twelfth century (cf. C. W. M. Grein, "Alsfelder Passionspiel," 1874).

The cauldron in "Branwen" (*Mabinogion*), in the legend of Medea, etc., is probably quite a different sort of thing; as are also the "Herb of St. John" and similar herbs.³

² Cf. Miss Weston, *The Legend of Sir Perceval*, I, 146: "The *Roman de la Violette* is not a very long poem, but in it we find references to *Yvain*, *Cligès*, *Tristan*, *Salomon et Markolf*, *La bone Florence de Rome*, *Carados*, *Aliseans*, . . . Guillaume *Fierabrace*; to Roland and Aude . . . Gerbert must have known pretty well all the popular stories of the day."

³ *Gaufrey* (ed. Guessard, 1859, vv. 3919-3958) mentions such a herb, but apparently owes something to the balm of *Fierabras* too.

Whence the author of *Fierabras* secured his balm I see no way to tell. It appears highly likely to me, however, that he drew upon folk-tale sources, probably of Celtic origin. As old as his references, or older, are those of Crestien to similar balms in *Erec* and *Yvain*. The particular twist that *Fierabras* gives to the balm motif is the connection with Christ and the Resurrection. But this connection was not a firm-fixed one, for when the author of *Morte Arthure* borrowed this passage of *Fierabras*,⁴ he did not hesitate to alter it to the extent of accounting for the balm as sprung from the "flower of the four wells of Paradise."

The association of the balm with the Lord's Resurrection and, in general, the readiness with which these heathen *données* were attached to Christian traditions or accounted for by reference to biblical events has raised in my mind the question whether or not this balm may not be intimately bound up with the origin of the Grail itself.⁵ My purpose in this note is not to discuss the possibility, but merely to point to several considerations that appear worthy of attention. And for mentioning the matter my excuse—besides the interest that attaches to Gerbert's use of *Fierabras*—must be the recent appearance of two studies upon the origin of the Grail story proper. Miss Weston, in volume II, of her *Legend of Sir Perceval* (Nutt, London, 1909), and Professor Nitze, in the September number of the *Publications of the Modern Language Association* (xxiv, 365 ff.), both believe the story grew out of an initiation ceremony or a ritual. If Miss Weston's contention is right, that Gawain was the earlier Grail hero,⁶ I think it highly probable that a ritual concerning the revival of vegetation,⁷

⁴ For details cf. my article, "Malory, *Morte Arthure*, and *Fierabras*" in *Anglia*, xxxii, 389 ff. (Oct., 1909).

⁵ Nutt's researches into the possible Celtic origin (*Studies on the Legend of the Holy Grail*) do not appear to me to attack just this point.

⁶ Cf. Miss Weston's "The Grail and the Rites of Adonis," *Folk-Lore*, xviii, 283 ff. (Dec., 1906).

⁷ It is interesting that *Fierabras* connects the balm with Midsummer: Oliver threw the barrels of balm into the river—

Or n'iert jamais li feste saint Jehan en esté

K'il ne flote sur l'yawe, c'est fine verités.

(Vv. 1051-2.)

Cf. also *Gaufrey*, vv. 3956-8.

rather than an initiation, was the starting point. It may well be that further analysis will show an interweaving of both ceremonies.

It appears certain that the Perceval tale (the hero's name being an unstable quantity) and the Grail story existed independently before their amalgamation; and the early Perceval tale included the balm incident, which in Crestien's version became submerged. The nature of the connection between the Grail and King Fisher, or the *Lame Fisher*, is obscure, as is also the nature of the Grail itself. It seems rather probable that in the earlier form of the story the Grail was less prominent and important than it came later to be. I do not mean to intimate that the Grail, as we know it, originated wholly from the balm of the Hag, but I would suggest that it may owe some parts of its story to the influence of the balm story. This will become more apparent if I place side by side some of the more striking traits of the two stories that seem to have a bearing upon the problem.

1. In the early form of the balm story⁸ the hero secures the balm, heals a wounded relative with it, and ends an enchantment; in Gerbert there is the suggestion of a dead realm in the Hag's connection with the "King of the Waste City"; the balm is both wound-healing and revivifying. In the Grail story proper the chief fact is that upon the hero's fulfillment of a certain condition a wounded man (his relative) will be healed, and (in some versions) his wasted and dead land restored to fertility; closely associated with the sufferer is a mysterious vessel that sustains his life.

2. The balm associated in a later tale (*Morte Arthure*) with Paradise, is in earlier tales associated with the Resurrection. The Grail came early to be associated with the Last Supper and the Crucifixion.

3. The balm itself was the important thing, not the vessel that contained it. The form of the Grail, in the early romances, was vague, uncertain; it was its power or its contents that was of significance.

4. The balm in the folk-tales was sometimes, perhaps usually, accompanied by the "glaive of

light"; in Gerbert the light-giving sword is absent, but the vessels of balm themselves have the light-giving power:—(Perceval is returning to Blancheflor;) Gornument et ses fils l'accompagneront, et quand vient la nuit—

... Tant vos di, ce est la voire,
Que li doi barisel d'ivoire
Que Perchevax ot conquesté
Font par laiens si grant clarté
Qu'ausi cler i fait, ce vos di,
Com s'il fust à plain miedi.

—Potvin, vi, 188.

The Grail had for one of its characteristics the power to give a brilliant light. (A sword, too, is important in some versions of the Grail story.)

5. The balm is first in the possession of a Hideous Hag, who, of course, is no invention of Gerbert's, for she occurs in early Irish as well as late Gaelic. The Loathly Damsel who reminded Perceval of the Grail quest certainly appears to have been modeled upon the Hag (cf. Crestien, Potvin, II, 5900 ff., and Wolfram's "Cundrie la surziere," *Parzival*, vi, 962 ff.)⁹.

6. In Gerbert the Hag connects herself with the Grail and the Grail-quest; this explanation, however, is susceptible of explanation as an echo from Crestien's poem.

If we were dependent upon Gerbert alone for the balm story, none of the points I have mentioned would be worthy of much consideration; but it is not greatly difficult to reconstruct from sources independent of Crestien and Gerbert the story that Gerbert partially tells.

R. H. GRIFFITH.

The University of Texas.

THE BALLAD OF EARL BRAND.

This interesting archaic ballad, well preserved even at this late day, may be added to the large and increasing number of British ballads of the better sort whose currency in America is attested.

(Folk-Songs of the North Atlantic States, collected by Phillips Barry. *Earl Brand*,—A. Re-

⁸ Cf. note 1 above.

⁹ With Wolfram's Cundrie compare Gerbert's Gondree, in Miss Weston's quotation, *Legend of Sir Perceval*, I, 122.

cited by D. L., Thornton, N. H., September 8, 1909.)

- 1 "Rise up, rise up, my seven sons all,
And put on your armor so gay,
And take care of your eldest sister
Or the younger man will carry her away."
- 2 Lord Billy mounts his milk-white steed,
Little Margaret on her gray,
With his bugle horn lopped down by his side,
This Lord went riding away.
- 3 He looked east, he looked west,
He looked all under the sun,—
'T was who did he spy but her seven brothers all,
And her daddy that she loved more dear.
- 4 "Dismount, dismount!" Lord Billy he said,
"And hold my steed in your hand,
Whilst I fight your seven brothers all,
For your daddy is now at hand."
- 5 She held his steed in her lily-white hand,
And never shed one tear,
Until she saw her seven brothers fall,
And her daddy she loved more dear.
- 6 "Forbear, forbear, Lord Billy!" she cried,
"For you have got wounded full sore,
Sweethearts, I can have many of them,
But my daddy I never know more!"
- 7 Then out of her pocket she drew a hankerchief,
That was made of the holland so fine,
And there she wiped her old daddy's wounds,
That run more redder than wine.
- 8 "Agree, agree, little Margaret," he said,
"Whether to go or abide,"
"How can I stay, Lord Billy," she cries,
"You have left me now disguised!"
- 9 Lord Billy mounts his milk-white steed,
Little Margaret all on her gray,
With his buglet horn lopped down by his side,
This Lord went bleeding away.
- 10 Lord Billy rode, little Margaret rode,
By the clear shining of the moon,
They rode till they came to the fair ocean side,
By the brink of the water so warm.
- 11 "What is that, Lord Billy," she cries,
"That runs so red in the stream?"
"It is nothing but the shadow of my scarlet robe,
That runs in the watery main."
- 12 Lord Billy he mounts his milk-white steed,
Little Margaret on the gray,
With his buglet horn lopped down by his side,
This Lord went bleeding away.

- 13 Lord Billy rode, little Margaret rode,
By the clear shining of the moon,
They rode till they came to his own mammy's door,
And there alighted down.
- 14 "Open the door, dear mammy," he said,
"And let Lord Billy in;
For I have got my own death wound,
If it's a fair lady I have won!"
- 15 "Make up my bed, dear mammy," he said,
"And lay my pillows all under my sheets,
And lie my true love down by my side,
That the sounder I might sleep."
- 16 Lord Billy died at the middle of the night,
Little Margaret at the break of day,
And they were both buried in the high churchyard,
Both side and side together.
- 17 Out of Lord Billy's breast there grew a red rose,
Out of little Margaret a briar,
And they grew till they came to the high church top,
And tangled into each other.

D. L. is a typical folk-singer. He says he knew at least one hundred and five songs.

PHILLIPS BARRY.

Boston, Massachusetts.

GERMAN HYMNS IN THE CHURCH SERVICE BEFORE THE REFORMATION.

The opinion was formerly held, even by such an authority as Philipp Wackernagel,¹ that German hymns were not used in the church service before the Reformation. It has been clearly shown however, especially by Wilhelm Bäumker,² that in some churches on certain occasions German hymns were in use from at least the early fifteenth century on, and in the liturgic drama even earlier. The chief occasions, according to Bäumker, were (1) in connection with liturgic dramas, (2) in connection with Latin sequences, usually in alternation with the Latin verses, (3) before and after the sermon, (4) in processions.

¹ Ph. Wackernagel, *Das deutsche Kirchenlied*, page v of Introd. to vol. II (1867).

² Wilh. Bäumker, *Das katholische deutsche Kirchenlied*, Introd. to vol. II (1883).

Bäumker's evidence includes a few specific cases but consists largely of decrees of church councils approving or disapproving the custom. The extent of the usage and the details regarding it are not well known. I offer here some additional data with particular reference to the Easter service. These few notes are a by-product of studies in the religious drama which led to the examination of a large number of liturgic manuscripts.

The services of Easter Sunday in many churches began before matins with the *Elevatio crucis*, the solemn raising of the cross that had been buried on Good Friday. In a few cases this developed into a dramatic office, and in two cases, Würzburg³ and Bamberg,⁴ it closed with the singing of the verses of the old Easter hymn *Christ ist erstanden* in alternation with the verses of the well known Easter sequence *Victimae paschali*.

The chief dramatic office of Easter, the *Visitatio sepulchri*, or *Quem quaeritis*, which regularly came after the last respond of matins, usually ended in Germany with *Christ ist erstanden* sung by the people. This usage goes back as far as the thirteenth century, the oldest known instance being the Nürnberg *Visitatio*.⁵ The usual position of the German hymn is at the end just before the *Te Deum* with which matins ended, in a few cases it follows the *Te Deum*, and in one case, in an Innsbruck manuscript,⁶ it has an anomalous position in the middle of the *Visitatio*. The statement has gained some currency that the Easter hymn *Also heilig ist der Tag* sometimes occurs at the end of the *Visitatio sepulchri*,⁷ the instance always given being the *Visitatio* in MS. 448 of the Stiftsbibliothek of St. Gallen. Although this manuscript, as will be seen later, has mention of this hymn, it does not occur in connection with the *Visitatio*, and I know of no case where the hymn does occur in such a connection.

³ Milchsack, *Die lateinischen Osterfeiern*, p. 135.

⁴ *Zt. f. deutsch. Altertum*, Vol. xxix, p. 250.

⁵ Lange, *Lateinische Osterfeiern*, p. 140. ⁶ *Id.*, p. 124.

⁷ Bäumker mentions the fact twice (I, 527, II, 11), referring to Schubiger, *Die Sängerschule St. Gallens* (1858). Schubiger makes the statement without mention of authority, as though based upon an examination of the manuscript, but he evidently took the statement from *Arx, Geschichten des Kantons St. Gallen, 1810-1830* (II, 461), where the mistake seems to have originated.

In a few churches the people sang a German Easter hymn after lauds. I have found only two instances, both from Bavarian monasteries. Cod. lat. 11735 of the Staatsbibliothek at Munich, a breviary of the fifteenth or perhaps the sixteenth century from Polling has in its Easter ritual the following rubric:

(f. 63a) *Finitis matutinis laudibus, apertis ianuis chori, benedictio cum pixide sacramenti super conventum et populum detur et ad locum deputatum cum duabus candelis accensis portetur, et cantor incipiat populo Es freyen sich pillich vel Christ ist erstanden.*

Cod. lat. 9469 of the Staatsbibl. at Munich, a breviary from Moosburg, probably of the fifteenth century, possibly of the early sixteenth, has at the end of the *Visitatio sepulchri* this rubric:

Populus Christ ist derstanden, vel obmittatur iste cantus vulgaris usque post Benedicamus post matutinas laudes, et imponatur statim Te deum laudamus. Later after the *Benedicamus* is the following: *Deinde populus Christ ist derstanden sic quo clauditur matutinum.*

More frequent than after lauds was the singing of a German hymn in the procession at terce, the *processio ad aspersionem*. In this the Latin *Salve festa dies* was sung and in quite a number of churches the people sang *Also heilig ist der Tag*, usually in alternation with the verses of the *Salve festa dies*. At Passau this usage, without mention however of any particular hymn, goes back to about the middle of the fourteenth century. Two fourteenth century Passau breviaries in the Hofbibliothek at Vienna, cod. lat. 4712 and cod. lat. 1874, the latter from the year 1364, mention it in the following words (the same words in both, but here quoted from cod. 4712, f. 48a): *Ad tertiam . . . deinde cantores incipiant Cum rex glorie, choro prosequente, et fiat processio sollemnis . . . duo pueri procedant cantantes versus Salve festa . . . donec versus finiantur, populus habeat suas vociferaciones Aevia aevia et alios cantus.* This same rubric, with slight variations in wording, is found in a whole series of Passau breviaries up to the sixteenth century, including early printed ones.

It is at this time in the Easter service, at terce, rather than in connection with the *Visitatio sepul-*

chri, that *Also heilig ist der Tag* occurs in the above mentioned St. Gallen codex 448 (p. 107). This codex, of the year 1432, doubtless represents the usages of the Hessian monastery of Hersfeld in the early part of the fifteenth century, which usages were for a short time adopted at St. Gallen.^a

At Polling and at Moosburg *Also heilig ist der Tag* was also sung at terce, as seen from rubrics in the two manuscripts referred to above, cod. 11735 fol. 63b and cod. 9469 fol. 59b, in the latter "populus habeat suas vociferaciones *Also her (!) ist diser tag.*"

There was this same usage at the monastery of Diessen, as seen from a fifteenth century Diessen manuscript in the Staatsbibliothek at Munich, cod. 5545. The rubric (fol. 21b) shows the alternating of verses of *Salve festa* with *Also heilig*: His finitis fiat processio . . . fiat stacio in medio ecclesie. Scholares juxta baptisterium cantent alta voce *Salve festa dies*, cantore incipiente, populus respondeat *Also heilig ist diser tag*; deinde cantent sequentes duos versus conjunctos, populus respondeat ut supra, secuntur ultimi duo versus conjuncti, populus iterum respondeat ut supra.

Another rubric in this same Diessen manuscript is of interest as showing that *Also heilig* with *Salve festa* was also sung in the procession on Ascension day: (f. 25a) In ascensione domini . . . ad processionem *Post passionem*; in stacione canitur *Salve festa*, populus *Also heilig*; sequuntur conjuncti sequentes duo versus, populus respondeat; sequitur quartus versus solus quare ultimus videlicet *qui crucifixus* obmittitur.

At Regensburg at the end of the fifteenth century *Salve festa* seems to have been sung at sext instead of at terce. The following rubric from an early printed breviary (*Breviarium Ratisbonense*, Bamberg, 1495) shows this, and is also interesting as showing the use of *Christ ist erstanden* instead of the usual *Also heilig* and the subsequent abolition of the usage: Ad terciam antiphona *Et ecce terre motus*, et immediate dicitur oratio *Deus qui hodierna die*. Ad sextam Antiphona *Hec dies quam . . . Oratio Deus qui hodierna die*. Deinde agatur processio secundum consuetudinem loci cum antiphona *Christus resurgens*, versus *In resurrectione tua Christe*. Oratio *Presta quesimus*

optimus deus. Deinde duo juvenes cantantes ymnus *Salve festa dies*, et chorus primum versum repetat *Salve festa*. Quondam etiam populus cantabat *Christ ist erstanden alleluia alleluia alleluia Des sollen wir alle froe sein*, sed nostris temporibus est aboletum, sed pueri cantent tres vel quattuor versus de ymno et chorus respondeat. Deinde imponitur antiphona *Cum rex glorie. . .*

The last participation of the people in the services of Easter Sunday was in connection with the procession at vespers, the *processio ad fontem*. Of this I have found three instances, at Hersfeld, at Polling, and at Diessen, all in manuscripts already mentioned.

The Hersfeld usage, which was doubtless also for a short time the usage of St. Gallen, is mentioned in the St. Gallen cod. 448 (p. 108): In sanctis vespers . . . repetatur sequencia *Victime*, ad singulos versus populus cantans *Christ ist erstanden*.

The Polling manuscript, cod. lat. 11735 of the Staatsbibliothek at Munich, has at vespers full directions for the usual *processio ad fontem*; at the end after the Latin chants it has this rubric: Tunc populus cantet *Christ ist erstanden* vel *Es freyen sich pillich*.

The Diessen manuscript, cod. lat. 5545 of the Staatsbibliothek at Munich, describes fully the singing of *Christ ist erstanden* in alternation with the *Victimae paschali*. The procession, apparently including the German hymn, was repeated at vespers throughout the week. The rubric reads: (f. 22a) Fiat processio ad fontem per totam hebdomidam cum antiphona *Vidi quam . . .* (several other chants and thurification of font and altars) . . . Deinde unus de cantoribus vel organista incipiat sequentiam *Victime paschali laudes*; populus, cantore preciniente, respondeat *Christ ist erstanden von der*; organista *Agnus redemit*; chorus conjungat *Mors et*; populus *Alleluia*; organista *Dic nobis*; chorus *Angelicos*; populus *Kirieleison*; organista *Credendum*; chorus *Scimus Christum*; populus *Wär er nit erstanden*. Finita sequentia, redeant ad chorum cum antiphona *Christus resurgens*; cantores cantent versum *Dicant nunc Iudei*; chorus *Quod enim vivit*.

These few notes show six or seven churches, mostly in Southern Germany, where German hymns were sung in the Easter service, not

^a See *Zt. f. deutsch. Altertum*, Vol. I, p. 310.

including the common use of *Christ ist erstanden* in the dramatic *Visitatio* and its occasional use in the *Elevatio crucis*. The manuscripts in which the cases occur extend from the middle of the fourteenth to the sixteenth century. There were some six places in the service of Easter Sunday alone where occasionally the people were allowed to participate in the services by the singing of a German hymn. While one church probably never had hymns at all six of these places, yet they did at times have them at four places in the Easter service; such was the case at Polling with *Christ ist erstanden* at the end of the *Visitatio sepulchri*, *Christ ist erstanden* or *Es freuen sich billig* after lauds, *Also heilig ist der Tag* at terce, and *Christ ist erstanden* or *Es freuen sich billig* at vespers.

NEIL C. BROOKS.

University of Illinois.

ACCENT MARKS IN MS. JESUS COLLEGE, OXFORD, 29.

In view of the date of the ms. (circa 1250), it may be worth while to record the following notes as to accent markings in *The Owl and the Nightingale* in ff. 229r-241v, of ms. Jesus College, Oxford, 29, in the Bodleian Library. The notes originated in study of the ms. itself and of photographs made by the Clarendon Press for my edition of the poem (*Belles Lettres Series*, D. C. Heath & Co., 1907). The term "stressed" refers to metrical stress.

Accent marks occur as follows:

I. On *i*: 332 times to distinguish *i* in *in*, *mi*, *ni*.

II. To mark prefix: (1) on *a*- separated (really prep. w. dat.) 682, cp. 239; not separated, 824. (2) on *i*- separated, 32 times—85, 114, 138, 166, 234, 252, 275, 301, 400, 403, 488, 501, 612, 705, 718, 847, 1121, 1158, 1197, 1216, 1220, 1225, 1241, 1311, 1319, 1515, 1516, 1529, 1545, 1628, 1645, 1735; not separated, 11 times—34, 371, 425, 451, 551, 771, 847, 1225, 1424, 1716, 1784. (3) on *i* of *bi*- separated, 1226, 1235; not separated, 137.

III. To mark (1) *ē* stressed in rime (rime-word not marked)—57, 202, 224, 234, 239, 301; *ē* stressed in rime—999-1000, *wēre* (rime-word *copinere*) 1341-42; *ē* stressed—*ēyen* 75, *wēnde* 288, *i hēre* 312, *tēres* 426, *vn vēle* 1381, *sēē* 1754; *ē* stressed, *spēke* 554.

(2) *ō* stressed in rime (rime-word not marked)—93, 290, 746 (cp. unmarked 1016), 1177, 1208, 1211, 1311, 1765; *ō* stressed—*gód* 329, *góde* 1369, *nón* 1705.

(3) *eo* stressed, *bi hēold* 108.

(4) *ī* stressed in rime—243-44, 1233-34, and with rime-word not marked 306, 320, 686, 894, 1592; *ī* stressed in rime—*witte fitte* 783-84, *witte sitte* 1243-44, *sitte* (rime-word *slytte*) 1117, *witte* (rime-word *sytt*) 1217, *is* (rime-word *a mys*) 1366, *is* (rime-word *wis*) 1317, 466; *ī* stressed—*pīpe* 22, *īvi* 27, 617, *wīues* 1562, *?wīs* 192 (perhaps a continuation of *N* of line above); *ī* stressed—*īc* (rhetorical stress) 754, *sittest* (see above) 894, *sitte* 282, *hīre* 1082, 1593, 1597, *vīch* 1378; *ī* unstressed—*euerīch* 355, 494, 922, 1271, 1279, 1315-16, *euerīche* 426 (perhaps to mark word division?), *is* 1312, 1498; *ī* unstressed—*bī* 793, *ī* (pronoun) 1218, *sorīe* 1162, *sorī mod* 1218, *īvi* 27, 617, and in weak rime *murīe vnmurīe* 345-46, *quatīe wlatīe* 353-54, *herīyngē* (rime-word *sīngē*) 981; *ī* stressed in rime, *drīueþ līueþ* 809-10, perhaps to distinguish first stroke of *iu* as *ī*, probably to mark rime of *ī* with *ī*.

IV. To mark stress in rime: *dōme tō me* 545-46, *cradele* (?) *apele* 631-32.

V. Mistaken for accent may be (1) a tick to call attention to error or seeming error—*his* (ms. Cotton *hit is*) 1384, *nōrþ* (ms. Cotton *neor*, rime-word *mester*) 923, *i schīre* (rime-word *wīue*) 1512: (2) a tick marking an insertion—*peý* 409 followed by small dot above, calling attention to tick and small dot and *þe* in margin; *śale* 1206 (misread by Gadow in his edition as *s'ale*) where the tick belongs to *schpes* in 1205 and with dot between *h* and *p* directs attention to missing *i*: (3) excess of stroke of split at top of *l*—*holde* 1419, *redles* 691, (?) *apele* 632: (4) excess of stroke of split at top of *h*—*schal* 960: (5) to mark *i* from first stroke of *r*,—*twēire* 888: cp. *i schīre* in (1) above.

VI. It is difficult to tell (cf. Morsbach, *M. E. Gram.*, § 10, ann. 3) why *e* in *wel* 1318 is marked. The stroke is, however, heavier and

shorter than the usual accent, and may not be an accent.

VII. Of interest is the back tick over the first stroke of *y* in *nys* 369 and *peyh* 128. It may be to assist to recognition of the real nature of the character *y* whose strokes are not marked off here by the dot so common in the ms.

JOHN EDWIN WELLS.

Hiram College.

A NOTE ON CALDERON'S *LA VIDA ES SUEÑO*.

Dr. Buchanan's carefully edited text of *La vida es sueño*, which has recently appeared at Toronto,¹ makes us feel that the study of the Spanish dramatist who was for a long time the one most admired by foreigners, is not wholly neglected to-day. The interest in Calderon's work is in need of the very stimulus which Dr. Buchanan's edition may prove to be to those students of Spanish literature, who are not inclined to devote over-much time or study to his plays. Perhaps the epoch of romantic enthusiasm which deified Calderon has passed never to return. The Schlegel brothers, Friedrich W. V. Schmidt, Schack and others, whose exaggerated praise is partly responsible for this reaction, have long since been in their graves, and no one feels inspired to continue Calderon criticism in a vein half so favorable to him. Possibly this opinion may be found to be erroneous after all, and some day Calderon will come into his own again. No matter how the verdict of time may change, we ought to be grateful to Dr. Buchanan for his good example. He promises us a second volume with notes and commentaries which will greatly increase the value of the first volume.

On pp. 99 ff. Dr. Buchanan substantially repeats the arguments already stated in *Mod. Lang. Notes*, 1907, pp. 215-16, with regard to a supposed reference to Calderon's play in Lope's *El Castigo sin venganza*: *bien dicen que nuestra vida es sueño*. Of course there can be no allusion to

Calderon in this phrase which is so common, that it needed but little comment. It occurs half a century earlier, in Cervantes's *Galatea*, the song of Tirsi:

*Es nuestra vida un sueño, un pasatiempo,
Un vano encanto que desaparece
Cuando mas firme pareció en su tiempo.*
(Edit. Rivadeneyra, p. 84, col. 1.)

The Spanish *Comedia*, in general, is a drama of stereotyped phrases. Take, for example, a similar expression which may be frequently found, and which, nevertheless, seems sufficiently original to attract attention: *y los sueños sueños son*, the last verse of the *segunda jornada*, p. 63; it forms the basis and the climax of Sigismundo's monologue. The verse occurs in a *villancico* long before Calderon's day:

*Sofaba yo que tenía
Alegre mi corazón;
Mas á la fe, madre mía,
Que los sueños sueños son.*²

In Lope's *La discreta enamorada*, included in the second list of *El Peregrino en su patria*, 1618, may be found:

*¡Ay sueño de mi afición!
¡Qué bien, pues que me engañé
Por vuestras burlas, diré
Que los sueños sueños son.*
(Edit. Rivadeneyra, I, p. 159, col. 2.)

In Tirso de Molina's *El Vergonzoso en Palacio*, first printed in *los Cigarrales de Toledo*, Madrid, 1624, but probably ready for press by 1621, according to the *aprobacion*, dated October 8th of that year, the following verses occur:

*Calle el alma su pasión,
Y sirva á mejores dueños,
Sin dar crédito á más sueños,
Que los sueños, sueños son.*
(Edit. Rivadeneyra, p. 221, col. 3, esc. ix.)

These are therefore stereotyped phrases which one might put down without being very original: *la vida es sueño*, or *los sueños sueños son*, and so one might add *sueños hay que son verdades* which is the title of another play.

My notes contain a reference to three old *sueeltas* s. l. e. a. of *la vida es sueño*, now in the

² Cf. p. 417 of *D. Juan Ruiz de Alarcón y Mendoza* by D. Luis Fernández-Guerra y Orbe, Madrid, 1871, and note 526.

¹ University of Toronto Library, 1909.

royal library at Berlin, marked XK 1410, seemingly the oldest, XK 1013, and XK 1500 in vol. I of a collection made by Braunfels. I am unable to say whether they are identical with those known to Dr. Buchanan, or whether they deserve collating with the text of the edition of 1636. Judging from the usual *suelta*, I should not say that they do.

The second volume promises us a discussion of the relation of *la vida es sueño* to *el Príncipe Don Carlos* by Enciso. As I knew very little about this subject when I wrote my article in *Mod. Lang. Notes* quite a number of years ago, and, in fact, *más valiera callarlo que decirlo*, know but little more about it now, it will be interesting to see Dr. Buchanan's conclusions. Dr. Wickersham Crawford, in *Mod. Lang. Notes*, 1907, pp. 238 ff., mentions a manuscript by Cañizares, which he calls an autograph and which is therefore supposed to solve the question of the revamped *Príncipe Don Carlos* as found in a *suelta* of 1773. Isn't it rather one of a large number of prompter's copies? There are three in the Municipal library of Madrid, and a collation alone of all will solve the question of the authorship of this *rifacimento*. The number of the bundle containing the prompter's copies is, I think, thirteen, and I never had the courage to examine them in detail.

RUDOLPH SCHEVILL.

Yale University.

RECENT PUBLICATIONS RELATING TO ELIZABETHAN STAGE HISTORY.

The past few years have yielded an unusual harvest in the field of Elizabethan drama. Professor Schelling's book¹ is, of course, in a class by itself as the first adequate and separate treatment of the period from the point of view of the plays themselves. Besides this, however, there has been a group of publications dealing with the external history of the drama of the period; and the accumulation of material, documentary and critical,

¹ *History of Elizabethan Drama*. Felix E. Schelling, 1908.

has been so rapid that the time seems near at hand for a continuous and fairly adequate history of the Elizabethan stage,—public, the so-called "private," and at the court. Mr. W. W. Grey has completed his series of three volumes,² I. The Text of Henslowe's Diary, II. Notes and Glossary, III. The Alleyn Papers, and has thus provided a safe text and appliances for using one of the most significant and perplexing of all Elizabethan dramatic records. Mr. Thompson's *The Puritans and the Stage*³ has been supplemented by Miss Gildersleeve's *Government Regulation of Elizabethan Drama*⁴ and Mr. Wallace's *Children of the Chapel at Blackfriars*,⁵ Miss Gildersleeve's book especially making vivid the continuous conflict of City Fathers and Puritanism on one hand, with royal and popular zeal for the drama on the other. Mr. Wallace's chief preoccupation has been with the significance of the Chapel Children in the dramatic activity of the times, and he announces his book to be the first of a series treating comprehensively the history of the child companies. Mr. Chambers, whose previous publications have given him the right to speak with much authority, has attacked⁶ the date claimed by Mr. Wallace for the beginning of the children's performances at Blackfriars, and thinks that their career, far from being so brilliant as Mr. Wallace suggests, was ingloriously subject to royal disfavour and interruption, because of their manager's indiscretion in the choice of plays and in other ways. Mr. Chambers would tend too to minimize the influence of this company upon other companies and theatres, and, perhaps unintentionally, leaves one with an added conviction that Mr. Wallace's zeal for his subject has dulled his sense of proportion. Mr. Wallace's conclusions, must in the present writer's opinion, inevitably be subjected to some deduction, and yet he seems to have made his main point, which concerns not only the successes and influence of the Chapel Children,

² W. W. Grey, *The Text of —*.

³ *The Puritans and the Stage*. E. N. S. Thompson, 1903.

⁴ *Government Regulation of the Elizabethan Drama*. Virginia Gildersleeve. *Columbia University Studies in English*, 1908.

⁵ *The Children of the Chapel at Blackfriars*. W. W. Wallace. *University of Nebraska Studies*, 1908.

⁶ *Modern Language Review*, January, 1909.

but the Queen's interest in them as a link between the drama of the Court and that of the popular stage. He is not, to be sure, quite convincing in his claims that Elizabeth herself attended the Children's performances at Blackfriars or that she was busy in making it a model for the public theatres, but he does create a strong probability of the directness of royal favour and assistance in the inauguration and maintenance of the company there, as also for the influence of stage conditions at Blackfriars upon other theatres during the Children's occupancy of this theatre. He cites an impressive array too of the greater dramatists who wrote for them and of well known plays shaped to suit their possibilities as actors; and in spite of our inevitable protest against his over-emphasis, makes us feel that a study of the plays written for children, taken separately from others, might yield interesting results. His book itself, being the record of a private theatre, furnishes the link in stage history, between the public theatres of London, and the Court theatres under the supervision of the Office of the Revels.

For the Court drama specifically, recent publications have not been less significant. Since more than a century ago, beginning with the contributions of Chalmers⁷ and of Malone,⁸ Elizabethan documents or fragments of documents bearing on the subject, have been appearing, but the publications have been scattered, often hard to secure, and so unfortunate in the editing that one has frequently been at a loss whether to accept any part of the editor's work as trustworthy. In 1906, however, Mr. Chambers began a better order of things by his *Notes on the Tudor Revels*,⁹ which, carefully reproduced in whole or in part, various important Revels documents, and sifted the evidence in regard to several problems of the Court drama. More recently M. Albert Feuillerat has done a much greater service by collecting into one careful volume all available documents relating to the Revels in the time of Queen Elizabeth. The documents are drawn from various repositories, many from the Public Record

Office, London; others from the British Museum, &c., and the editor regards the collection as exhaustive, so far as extant material is concerned. The volume is announced as the first of a series which is to include all documents relating to English Court drama, whether before printed or not. The plan includes four volumes, the present one, for reasons of special convenience printed first, though third in the chronology of the documents involved; a second, dealing with the Revels in the time of Edward VI and of Mary; a third, with the Court Festivities under Henry VIII; and a fourth with the Revels in the days of the Stuarts. The second volume is declared in the Preface to this one to be already completed.

M. Feuillerat does not claim to have brought to light much new material. Most of his documents as he explains, Collier¹⁰ and Cunningham¹¹ have come upon before himself, though he might have pointed out that Malone, Chalmers, and others had preceded these in finding a good deal of the material. He himself, however, has made valuable and interesting additions to the collection, some of them having a strong independent interest, as the Inventory of the Office of the Revels in 1560, and certain petitions in the Appendix; whereas others are valuable as filling out the Accounts of the Revels Office into a practically continuous record. M. Feuillerat's chief concern, however, has been to present carefully edited texts for both the known and the newly found documents, and so to provide solid foundations for scholarly work in the history of the Court drama. He has been especially careful to avoid the faults of Collier and Cunningham, restoring some of the Elizabethan spelling neglected by the latter, and adding much which one or the other of them failed to transcribe. An example of his fuller text will be found by comparing *Revels Documents*, p. 47, with Cunningham's *Extracts from the Accounts of the Revels* (Shakespeare Society, 1842), p. 16. A difference in another direction is found in M. Feuillerat's omission of a page cited by Cunningham.¹² This page the

⁷*An Apology for Believers*, &c. Chalmers. *A Supplemental Apology for Believers*. Chalmers.

⁸*History of the Stage*. Vol. III. First Variorum Shakespeare, ed. Edmund Malone, 1791.

⁹*Notes on the Tudor Revels*. E. K. Chambers, 1906.

¹⁰*A History of English Dramatic Literature*. J. P. Collier.

¹¹*Extracts from the Accounts of the Revels*. P. Cunningham. Shakespeare Society, 1842.

¹²In the *Accounts from 31 October to 1 March, 1573-4*, p. 456.

later editor thinks has certainly been lost since Cunningham copied it, and we are relieved to be spared a new ascription of forgery on the part of Cunningham. Indeed, M. Feuillerat's review of the latter's work tends on the whole to help his good name, though the same cannot be said for Collier. M. Feuillerat has given much time to adjusting relations between the records of the various sorts, as those of the Revels Office itself, the Declared Accounts of the Treasurer of the Chamber, the Acts of the Privy Council, the Imprest Certificate Books, &c., and he has analyzed with great care the conclusions of earlier workers in this connection, with the result that he differs from Mr. Chambers in various points of detail, as of the date of the survey of St. John of Jerusalem, the seat of the Revels; that Thos. Blagrave was appointed by privy seal; and from earlier critics in general, as to the date of the death of Sir Thomas Benger, Master of the Revels.

The editorial method followed is intelligent and on the whole convincing in its wisdom, although it does not attempt the exactness of absolute reproduction. For example, the Auditor's notes on the Accounts are retained or omitted at the editor's discretion, and all abbreviations are drawn out into the full spelling for the convenience of the reader, the change being indicated by italicising the letters added. On the other hand, a great deal of effort has been given to distinguishing one handwriting from another in the entries of changes by the Revels Officers, the difference being marked by a change of type, with the asterisk to call attention to the reason for change.

The collection of documents is divided into two parts, with a valuable appendix, full notes and various indexes subjoined. The usual introductory discussion of the matter of the text is deferred as being bulky enough to require a separate volume. Part I includes under the title, *The Office and Officers*, ten documents, among them, a new and most interesting Inventory of the Stuff of the Revels Office taken in 1860, A Survey of the Seat of the Revels Office. Part II presents the Accounts themselves, and various warrants.

The Appendix, made up of both old and new material, is perhaps the part fullest of human interest, as it contains chiefly of com-

plaints or petitions and throws many side lights on the loose management of the office and the consequent inconvenience to those involved. There is the somewhat amusing complaint of Thomas Gylles against the Yeoman of the Revels for lending the costumes of the Revels far and wide, with "the red clothe of golde gownes" which were lent "to a taylor marrying in the blakfryer" and to various others of humble station and questionable neatness, until the garments are unfit for the noble masquers who are wont to use them. There is a petition from the Yeoman himself too, calling attention to "sarten thinges which are very nedefull to be Redressed in the Office of the Revelles" and showing the consequent discredit that was coming to the office from every side, "which thing," the complainant adds mournfully, "for my part I am very sorry to see." But the petition which draws us most is the well-known one in which "the poore creditours themselves most needefully desire payment" of money now more than two years due.

Of the illuminating effect of such a collection of documents, one could hardly say too much, and it is because of the mass and variety of material presented in M. Feuillerat's volume that the impression of life is so vivid and convincing. Heretofore there have been only suggestions, or snatches of impressions, now the life stands revealed. And it is not merely the story of the Court drama itself, but of all the force of labourers who made it possible, the variety of work and of workmen conspiring to the one great end, the many shopkeepers coming and going, the hours and wages of labour, the part of the children in the task of amusement, the wretched management of the office, the barrenness of the Queen's Exchequer, and all the rest. In what concerns chiefly the history of the drama itself, one is once more impressed with the large elaborateness of Court staging, for plays and actors coming from the public theatres, and one gains an added conviction that modern critics as well as Mr. Ben Greet, have been too ready to believe that actors would have been content to shift back and forth between barrenness and a surprisingly elaborate stage. One wonders whether M. Feuillerat's deferred introduction will not do something to prove a fuller equipment for the public Elizabethan stage.

We might note too, though as a digression, the rapid accumulation of discoveries and studies tending to make real and vivid to us the Elizabethan life which the dramatists presented in their plays, and of which they were themselves a part. Professor Wallace's recent discoveries in the Public Record Office, London, are the most significant as throwing light on Shakespeare's London residence and social relations during the years when some of his greatest plays were being written, making clear his neighborly instinct, his sympathy with young and old, and his contact with a French household while he was writing *Henry V*; making plausible too, a host of sentimental inferences so tempting that writers are already busy upon them.¹³ Mr. A. W. Pollard's *Shakespeare's Folios and Quartos, A Study in the Bibliography of Shakespeare's Plays 1594-1685*,¹⁴ tells the story of the publication of the quartos and folios, explains conditions governing publications in Shakespeare's day, laws regulating licenses, &c., and contributes insight if not a large bulk of new material. There are various books too, of the type of *The Elizabethan People*,¹⁵ by Henry Thew Stephenson, and *The Literary Profession in the Elizabethan Age*,¹⁶ the last much more contributive than Mr. Stephenson's book but both helping in the appaeniation of the age, of the economic, social and other conditions which prevailed, and especially of that elusive compound, the Elizabethan spirit.

When one considers not only Professor Wallace's Shakespearian discoveries noted above, but earlier ones published or reported at various times by him,¹⁷

¹³ The necessity for caution in such inferences is, however, already suggested by Professor Bruce's timely reminder in *The Nation*, March 12, that the name *Mountjoy* or *Montjoy* is found already in Holinshed, one of Shakespeare's sources, though not in the other and later, *The Famous Victories*.

¹⁴ Methuen Co., 1909.

¹⁵ Published by Henry Holt & Co., 1910.

¹⁶ Publications of the University of Manchester, English Series, I, University Press, Manchester, 1909.

¹⁷ *The Newly Discovered Shakespeare Documents in University of Nebraska Studies*, 1905, and *Englische Studien*, April, 1906; certain documents concerning Blackfriars Theatre, announced—1906, *The New York Times*; *The Children of the Chapel at Blackfriars in University of Nebraska Studies*, 1908; *Recasting the History of Shakespeare in The New York Times*, October 3, 1909.

and still others, by other scholars, conveniently cited by Mr. Sidney Lee in the preface of his 1908 edition of his *Life of William Shakespeare*, there seems ground for hoping that we may grow into fairly vivid realization not only of the man Shakespeare himself, but of the theatrical circle and special stage history which are of supreme interest because of their relation to him. The future historian of the Elizabethan stage must find himself immensely richer than he could otherwise have been, by reason of the very recent acquisitions of scholars; and while we may differ from Mr. Wallace at times, as to relative values, no one will be slow to grant that his discoveries are among the most interesting and significant that modern searchers have brought to light.

O. L. HATCHER.

Bryn Mawr College.

A NOTE ON *BEOWULF* 1142-1145.

My attention has been drawn by a note in the new edition of Holthausen's *Beowulf* (vol. II, p. xxviii f.), to some interesting observations by Dr. R. Imelmann, of Bonn, as to lines 1142-1145 of *Beowulf*, in the *Deutsche Literaturzeitung* of 17 April, 1909. Imelmann considers that Hunlafing is the name of a brother of Guthlaf and Oslaf (= the Ordlaaf of *Finnsburg* 18), and that he joined them in helping Hengest to revenge himself on Finn and carry off Hildeburh. The name occurs in a late Brut-version (Cott. Vesp. D iv) at fol. 139b :—

"In diebus illis, imperante Valentiniano, regnum barbarorum et germanorum exortum est, turgentesque populi et nationes per totam Europam consederunt. Hoc testantur gesta Rodulphi et Hunlapi, Unwini et Widie, Horsi et Hengisti, Waltef et Hame, quorum quidam in Italia, quidam in Gallia, alii in Britannia, ceteri vero in Germania armis et rebus bellicis claruerunt."

He also quotes Chadwick, *Origins of the English Nation*, 1907, p. 52, as pointing out that in the *Skioldunga Saga* three of the seven sons of the Danish King Leifus are called *Hunleifus*, *Oddleifus* and *Gunnleifus*; and René Huchon (*Revue*

Germanique, III, 626¹) as identifying them with the three Beowulfine heroes. And he says Huchon rightly translates the passage,—which he does as follows:—“Aussi lui, (Hengest) ne recula-t'il pas devant la destinée, lorsque Hunlafing le mit en possession de la lumière de la guerre, de l'excellente épée, dont le tranchant était fameux parmi les Jutes (ou parmi les géants).” Imelmann himself translates line 1142 ‘Daher verweigerte er es dem Geschick nicht’ (= sah darin seinen Wink und gehorchte ihm).

I venture to suggest that Hunlaf, and not Hunlafing, is the proper name of Oslaf and Guthlaf's brother, and that the reference in line 1143 is to a son of Hunlaf. This is in accordance with both the authorities quoted by Imelmann, and it would agree with the usual custom in Anglo-Saxon nomenclature, while it would be difficult, if not impossible, to find a case where one brother's name ended in the same syllable as that of the others, but with the addition of *-ing*. It is no doubt unusual in *Beowulf* to mention a son of somebody without also mentioning his own name (Scyld Scēfing, etc.). We have Wælsing standing by itself at line 877, but Sigemund's name is given at line 875, so that is not a strong parallel:—but this seems a less difficulty than the other. If we may go by the order in the *Skiplunga Saga*, Hunlaf would be the eldest brother, and probably he was dead before the attack in the *Finnsburg*. It is noteworthy that he, and not Guthlaf and Oslaf, are mentioned in the Brut-version (above quoted) which also contains the name of Hengest. If, as is not unlikely, Hunlaf had been killed by the Frisians, lines 1148–1150 may well have reference to Guthlaf and Oslaf's personal loss, and to their position as his natural avengers.

It is a great relief to find that the personage of line 1143 is a Dane, as it clears out of the road translations which must have been felt to be unsatisfactory. There must, however, still be some doubt as to the exact meaning of lines 1142 and 1145.

(1) ‘*woroldræden*’ is, I think, not ‘law of the world’ or ‘fate,’ but ‘custom of the world,’ looked at from the religious point of view (see the compounds of ‘*weorold*’ in Bosworth-Toller) so

that the line would mean ‘He did not run counter to the way of the world,’ i. e., he fell into temptation, as most people would have done under such circumstances (*swā*). This point of view is exemplified elsewhere in *Beowulf* (e. g., *worldār*, 17) and seems more likely here than the too Oriental fatalism of ‘He did not resist his fate,’ or the too cynical ‘He took the hint.’

(2) What does line 1145 mean? Was *Hildeleoma* (I adopt Holthausen's suggestion that this is the proper name of a sword) originally a Danish or a Frisian sword? Had Hunlaf, or Hunlaf's son, captured it in a former contest, or had it been given to him at the dealings out of treasure? The last supposition seems most unlikely. Most probably the sword was a Danish one, and it may be that we must take line 1145 as meaning that it had already done good service in fight against the Eotens. The recollection of its past history would thus be likely to rouse Hengest.

But there is another alternative:—*ðæs* may here mean ‘hence,’ ‘and so’;—the line referring to the future. ‘And so its edges became well known among the Eotens’ (i. e., Hengest made good use of it). It may be objected that adverbial *ðæs* never begins a clause in *Beowulf*, but as the same may be said of demonstrative *ðæs*, this is not a serious objection. (The fact is that the position of *ðæs* in this line is unique in the poem.) The use of *swylce* in the next line seems to me rather to favor the view of a future interpretation (Schücking, *Satzverknüpfung*, pp. 84, 85, and cp. especially lines 1151–2, where the meaning is clearly ‘besides this’).

JOHN R. CLARK HALL.

Heworth, York, England.

WOODBERRY'S REVISED LIFE OF POE.

The Life of Edgar Allan Poe, Personal and Literary, with his Chief Correspondence with Men of Letters. By George E. Woodberry. 2 vols. Pp. xii + 383; viii + 481. Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1909.

Students of Poe everywhere will welcome the revised edition of Professor George E. Wood-

¹“Rev. Herman.” in the *Dtsch. Litztg.* and Holthausen, is a misprint.

berry's *Life of Poe*.¹ Since the first edition of this work made its appearance, now nearly a quarter of a century ago, several other lives of Poe have appeared—one of them, that of Prof. James A. Harrison, an excellent one—but even Professor Harrison's interesting and sympathetic life can hardly be said to have superseded Professor Woodberry's. Naturally, however, as the years passed, a good many new facts about Poe had been brought out; so that, as Professor Woodberry frankly puts it, the original edition had "become antiquated by its omissions." To collect and sift this new material was one of the chief tasks of the revision. And this task Professor Woodberry has performed with characteristic thoroughness and discrimination. To the contributions of others, however, he has added but few of his own,—fewer by far than his earlier biography, with its notable contributions, might have led us to expect. But this Professor Woodberry explains by the admission in his preface that he has made no personal investigation of his subject since writing the first edition.

The work has grown, in its revision, from a single volume of about 350 pages to two volumes containing over 850 pages. This increase in size comes about mainly through the incorporation into the text of a large number of letters and through the affixing of an appendix to each volume. A change in type also had something to do with the increase in size.

The appendixes—in all about 125 pages—comprise the most interesting parts of the new volumes. They contain, besides sundry "notes mainly on obscure or controverted points," a discussion of the homes of Poe in Richmond, the Poe-Duane letters (concerning the lost volume of the *Southern Literary Messenger*), Lowell's letters about Poe to Briggs, several hitherto unpublished letters of Poe (to Lucian Minor, Mathew Carey, A. B. Magruder, Neilson Poe, C. G. Percival, and Bayard Taylor), a restatement of the author's views on Poe's relations with Chivers, a note on "Griswold's world" (in which a good word is said for Griswold as anthologist), fragments of an unpublished tale of Poe's known as *The Light-house*, and a bibliography of the tales and poems, together with edi-

torial notes about them. Not the least valuable of these is the last-mentioned, in which Professor Woodberry presents, along with much other bibliographical material, his own views as to the time of composition of each of Poe's poems and tales. The fragment of *The Light-house*, recently found by Professor Woodberry among the Griswold mss., is brief, and of little interest other than historical. In the "notes on obscure or controverted points," some twenty or thirty points on which opinion still differs or which yet remain problematic are dealt with. In the first of these the question—still mooted, absurdly enough, in some quarters—of the time and place of Poe's birth, is discussed anew. Then comes a detailed account of the theatrical career of Poe's parents; then a discussion of Poe's alleged trip to Europe in 1827, a topic not touched on in the original work. Other topics dealt with are Poe's life at West Point (concerning which some reminiscences of a classmate, T. P. Jones, of Seguin, Texas, are given); Poe's *Mary* (now shown to have become the wife of a Mr. T. C. Leland—though her maiden name remains a mystery); Poe's indebtedness to E. T. A. Hoffmann; Poe's association with Mayne Reid; Poe's relations with Horace Greeley (showing that Poe once remonstrated with Greeley for charging him with unscrupulous neglect of financial obligations); Poe's embryonic affair of honor with John M. Daniel (a resumé of Mr. Whitty's account); Poe's use of opium; and, to conclude with, the authenticity of Griswold's sketch. Poe's indebtedness to Hoffmann, which Professor Palmer Cobb, in a recent Columbia University dissertation, endeavors to show to have been direct, Professor Woodberry holds was indirect, through Scott's article in the *Foreign Quarterly Review* for July, 1827, for the most part; and he still insists, despite the researches of Professor Cobb and of Professor Gruener, of Harvard, that Poe knew little or no German. On the subject of Poe's use of opium, Professor Woodberry, after giving the testimony of others, expresses this opinion of his own (II, p. 430): "I incline to the view that Poe began the use of drugs in Baltimore, that his periods of abstinence from liquor were periods of at least moderate indulgence in opium, and that in 1846-47 under the advice of his physicians he abandoned the habit;

¹ First published in Boston in 1885.

that his physical state and mode of life in 1847 are connected with this attempt, and his supposed success in it was the ground of his many statements that the 'physical cause' of his fits of intemperance had ceased and the reiterated expressions of the excellence of his health; and that his begging for laudanum after his sprees was a sign of lapsing into an older habit, which he did not take with him to Richmond." In his note on Griswold and Poe, Professor Woodberry comes strongly to the defence of Griswold. The concluding paragraph of his note sufficiently indicates the attitude that he takes (II, p. 454): "To Griswold's memoir no reply, so far as I know, was made by Poe's friends, except in so far as Burr's article (1852) was a plea in mitigation of judgment, and, long afterwards, Clarke's article (1868) quoted, with cordial endorsement, the testimony of Willis, and added a few words of the writer's own. On the other hand, Thompson, Thomas, and Kennedy, and Mrs. Lewis remained on friendly terms with Griswold; English, Briggs, and Wallace sustained him" [which we must interject, was the most natural thing conceivable, since each was an avowed enemy of Poe], "Redfield and Leland defended him, and Stoddard wrote often and much to substantiate his statements. It is also just to add that the characterization that Griswold gave, in substance though not in feeling, was the same as that which uniformly prevailed in tradition in the best-informed literary circles in this country. The rebirth of Poe's reputation took place in writers of the next generation." In most of what he says here, Professor Woodberry is doubtless right. It must be pretty clear that Griswold has done too heavy a penance for his betrayal of the trust reposed in him as Poe's literary executor. For, in truth, Griswold's unfairness to Poe came less in specific charges against Poe, than in the animus with which these charges were presented and in the omission of much that might have been urged in explanation and extenuation of these charges. But Professor Woodberry overshoots the mark when he expresses the opinion that but two or three replies to Griswold's memoir were made. Because of the memorable notice in the *Tribune*, Griswold, we are told, "was hotly as-

sailed on all sides."² But he was also called to account for what he wrote in the memoir proper, and not only by Clarke and Burr, but also by Mrs. Whitman in her "Edgar Poe and his Critics"; by W. J. Pabodie in a letter of June 2, 1852, to the *New York Tribune* and in a private letter to Griswold of June 11, 1852 (*Virginia Poe*, xvii, pp. 408 f., 412 f.); by J. Wood Davidson (in *Russell's Magazine*, November, 1857, I, pp. 170 f.); and by Wilmer (in *The Press Gang*, Philadelphia, 1859, p. 385); and Ingram also mentions vindictory articles by Mr. Moy Thomas and Mayne Reid, which I have not seen.

Most of the letters now first incorporated into the text had been published before, either by Professor Harrison or by Professor Woodberry himself, but a half-dozen or more appear now for the first time, among them two letters to Kennedy, dated December 31, 1840, and June, 1841, (I, pp. 266 f., 280 f.); one to Thomas, August 27, 1847, concerning the government position which he had endeavored to secure for Poe, (I, pp. 335-7); and one to Bowen and Gossler, editors of a Columbia (Pa.) paper, a strange letter, of January 18, 1844, concerning literary conditions in New York at that time (II, pp. 81-7). Among topics that are new or that are treated at greater length than in the old edition are these: Poe's relations to the Allans (I, pp. 54, 68, 73 f., 94 f.); his life in Baltimore between 1831 and 1835, in particular his love-making with a cousin, Miss Herring (concerning whom new information has been furnished by Miss A. F. Poe), and the more desperate love-affair with his Baltimore *Mary* (Professor Woodberry accepting *in toto* the story of "Poe's Mary" printed in *Harper's Monthly* a number of years ago); the tradition of Poe's flirtation in Richmond with Miss Eliza White, and the suggestion that this had something to do with Poe's "hasty marriage to Virginia" (I, p. 185); the genesis and development of *The Raven* (II, pp. 111 f.); the poet's unhappy experiences in Philadelphia in the summer of 1849 (II, pp. 311 f.); and, finally, his career in Richmond during his last two visits there in

²I quote the words of R. H. Stoddard, whom Mr. Woodberry mentions among Griswold's staunchest supporters.

the summers of 1848 and 1849 (II, pp. 317-342). Concerning Poe's relations with the Allans, Professor Woodberry now holds, with Professor Harrison, that Mr. Allan never contemplated making Poe his heir. He also inclines to credit the tradition that the rupture between the two grew out of some piece of misconduct on Poe's part, the facts of which are well known to certain of the descendants of Mr. Allan, but have not been disclosed to the public (I, pp. 102-3, note). The theory of the composition of *The Raven* to which Professor Woodberry now gives his endorsement, is this: the true germ of the poem is to be found in Poe's review of *Barnaby Rudge* in 1842 (a view already advanced by Ingram), and the poem may have been begun in this year; one draft of it had been completed by the summer of 1843; the poem was revised and completed in the autumn or early winter of 1844-45 after Poe had moved to 15 Amity Street. It will thus be seen that Professor Woodberry accepts not only the accounts of Rosenbach, Mrs. Brennan, and Du Solle, but also that of W. E. Griffis, which in the original edition (p. 221, note) he characterized as "highly improbable." Concerning the authenticity of the half-dozen poems variously attributed to Poe³ yet not regularly included in the editions of his works, Professor Woodberry disdains to give an opinion—he ignores them both in the body of his text and in the bibliography of the poems; he does pass judgment, however, on the genuineness of a number of translations which appeared in the *New Mirror* above the signature of "E. P."⁴ An interesting conjecture offered now for the first time is that the poem entitled *Ballad* in the *Southern Literary Messenger* for August, 1835, and signed "Sidney," was the first draft of *Bridal Ballad*.

There are but few points on which the biographer has shifted ground since the appearance of his first edition. He still adheres, for instance, to the tradition that Poe was privately wedded to

Virginia Clemm in Baltimore a year before their public marriage in Richmond,—indeed, he states this as a fact in his index; he repeats (I, p. 82) his vague but tantalizing assertion that *The Valley of Unrest*, *Israfel*, and *The City of the Sea* were "developed from slight Oriental suggestions"; and he reiterates (II, p. 259) the statement that the parallelism between *The Bells* and a passage in Châteaubriand's *Génie du Christianisme* "is not likely to be a fortuitous coincidence."⁵ He has changed front, however, with reference to Poe's friendship for Mrs. Stanard. In his earlier edition (p. 23) he had said, in agreement with other biographers, that Mrs. Stanard was for a short time Poe's "confidante and friend," and that after her death he "for a long while . . . haunted her grave by night." In the present edition (I, p. 29) he maintains that Poe saw Mrs. Stanard only once, and that "the tale that he haunted her grave by night, with all its later Poesque atmosphere, must be dismissed." The grounds for this reversal of opinion will not readily appear to any except these who are familiar with Mrs. Weiss's deliverance on the point. Mrs. Weiss says (in her *The Home Life of Poe*, p. 39) that the cemetery in which Mrs. Stanard was buried was surrounded by high walls and that the gates of the cemetery were securely locked by night; furthermore, that the discipline of the Allan household was very strict; so that, if she be correct in these particulars, the midnight excursions which Poe is traditionally reported to have made, must have been impossible. Another shift is made with reference to the poet's relations with Mrs. Shelton in 1848. In the earlier edition (p. 311) Poe's message to Mrs. Whitman from Richmond, "I was about to enter on a course which would have borne me far, far away, from you, sweet, sweet Helen," was interpreted as referring to "his intention of offering his hand to Mrs. Shelton." In the new edition this explanation is omitted, Professor Woodberry inclining apparently to the view proposed by Mr. Whitty, that Poe had reference to the duel which he expected to fight with John M. Daniel. But reference to Professor J. A. Harrison's recent edition

³ *The Mammoth Squash*, *The Fire Legend*, *The Magician*, *The Skeleton Hand*, the *Hymn in Honor of Harmodius and Aristogeiton*, the "Lavante" satire, and the two skits to his cousin Elizabeth.

⁴ These Professor Woodberry denies to Poe, suggesting at the same time that they were "from the pen of Emily Perceval" (II, p. 103, note).

⁵ Professor Woodberry's insistence upon this point seems to me to be out of keeping with his usual conservatism in such matters.

of Poe's letters to Mrs. Whitman (*Last Letters of Edgar Allan Poe to Sarah Helen Whitman*, New York, 1909, p. 13) shows that Poe's letter on which the whole question had turned had been garbled in the printed texts just at the crucial point, and that instead of the words "was about to enter on a course" etc., we actually have these words: "was about to depart on a tour and an enterprise which would have changed my very nature—fearfully altered my very soul—steeped me in a stern, cold, and debasing, although brilliant gigantic ambition—and borne me 'far, far away' from you,"—words which assuredly cannot refer to a projected duel. In my judgment, it refers, as Professor Woodberry first conjectured, to his projected marriage to Mrs. Shelton, the "gigantic ambition" alluded to being perhaps the establishment of a magazine with the aid of her money. Noteworthy also is the omission of sundry depreciatory references to Poe which appeared in the former edition,—among them the statements as to the untrustworthiness of Poe's word (pp. 31 and 222-3), the comment on his lack of humor (p. 85), the condemnatory judgment on the last stanza of *Bridal Ballad* (pp. 94-5), and the statement as to Poe's proneness to paraphrase from others (p. 97). But more noteworthy still is the comment made in the first volume of the new edition (p. 123), that "the question of Poe's physique is fundamental in his biography,"—a concession to Robertson, Lauvrière, and other friends of Poe.

Errors of statement are few for a work in which such a vast amount of detail is collected. The assertion (II, p. 259) that Poe was "in early years under considerable obligations" to Châteaubriand's *Génie du Christianisme* must be due to a confounding of this work with Châteaubriand's *Itinéraire de Paris à Jérusalem*, which Professor Woodberry claims was the source of the line "Isola d'oro!—Fior di Levante!" embodied by Poe in his *Al Aaraaf* and his *Sonnet to Zante*. And surely it is too much to say that this slight indebtedness involves "considerable obligations." Another error appears in a note in the appendix to the first volume, p. 377. It is asserted here that "the date of the arrival of Mrs. Clemm and Virginia in Richmond [to make their home there] was Oct. 1, 1836"; and in support of this the

letter of Mrs. Clemm to William Poe of date October 7, 1836, is cited. In reality, Mrs. Clemm and her daughter had moved to Richmond almost a year before this, probably in the autumn of 1835 when Poe returned to Richmond to resume his place on the *Messenger*. This is established by Poe's letter of January 12, 1836, in which it appears that Mrs. Clemm was then living in Richmond; other letters bearing on the point are Mrs. Clemm's of February 21 and April 12, 1836. The letter to William Poe which Professor Woodberry unhappily lays hold of in this connection perhaps has reference merely to Mrs. Clemm's return from a visit to Baltimore,—either that, or (as is more probable) the date of the letter is erroneously given as 1836 instead of 1835. Contradictory is the statement (I, p. 198): "He is to be credited, too, with a translation and digest of Lemonnier's *Natural History* . . . ; but there is no indication that he had any part in this work beyond his own statement, in reviewing it, that he spoke 'from personal knowledge, and the closest inspection and collation.'" The first edition (p. 113) avoided the difficulty by reading, "He has been credited" etc. Erroneous also is the statement (II, p. 163) that Poe's 1845 volume of poems, *The Raven and Other Poems*, was issued "Just at the close of the year, apparently on December 31." It must have appeared a month or more before this; for Poe mentioned it in *The Broadway Journal* of November 22 as being among the books "on hand for notice";⁶ and in the same journal for December 13 he reprinted a review of it from the *Brook Farm Phalanx* of December 6. Another correction to be made is in the date of *Siope*. This tale was not published "in the fall of 1838," as is said in I, p. 198, but in the fall of 1837. The *Baltimore Book*, in which it came out, was reviewed in the *Baltimore Monument* for December 2, 1837 (p. 68), the contents of the volume being described there at length. Erroneous, too, are the dates given to *Fifty Suggestions*, the lines *To — — —* (to Mrs. Shew), and the review of Lowell's *Fable for Critics*, on pp. 257, 268, and 296, respectively,

⁶In the same number of the *Broadway Journal*, Wiley and Putnam advertised the volume for sale, offering it at 31 cents.

of the same volume. Worth noting, also, is the slip made in asserting (II, p. 412) that the poem *Alone*, which first appeared in *Scribner's Magazine* for September, 1875, "was copied into a Baltimore album March 17, 1829." On the facsimile of the poem as printed in *Scribner's*, there are words to that effect, but more than ten years ago Professor Woodberry, in his edition of Poe's poems (in collaboration with the poet Stedman⁷) had expressed doubt as to the authenticity of these words; and Mr. E. L. Didier, who sent the facsimile to the editors of *Scribner's*, has since admitted⁸ that these words were not originally in the manuscript of the poem, but were supplied by himself. To the bibliography of the tales and poems (II, pp. 400 f.) the following additions should be made: under *Morella* (p. 400), *Burton's Gentleman's Magazine* for November, 1839; under *The Fall of the House of Usher* (p. 402), *Griswold's Prose Writers of America*, first three editions (see Poe's letter to Griswold of February 24, 1845, "Virginia Poe," XVII, p. 201); under *To Science* (p. 412), *Graham's Magazine* for June, 1841; under *Scenes from Politian* (p. 414), the excerpt of that play printed by Ingram in an edition of Poe's poems, New York, no date, pp. 96 f., and the briefer extracts incorporated in his article on "Politian" in *The Southern Magazine*, XVII, pp. 588 f.; under *Ulatume* (p. 416), *The Literary World* of March 3, 1849 (see Poe's letters of February 16 and March 8, 1849, to E. A. Duyckinck, then one of the editors of *The Literary World*); under the sonnet *To My Mother* (p. 416), *The Leaflets of Memory* for 1850 (p. 68); and under *The Raven* and *The Conqueror Worm* (both on p. 415), the ninth edition of *Griswold's The Poets and Poetry of America* (Philadelphia, 1848).⁹ Under *To —* ("I heed not that my earthly lot") (p. 412) the date 1845 should be deleted, since this poem did not appear in the volume of poems brought out in that year.

⁷ See *The Works of Edgar Allan Poe*, Chicago, 1894-6, x, p. 237.

⁸ In his *The Poe Cult and Other Essays*, New York, 1909, p. 270.

⁹ Cf. also my article in *The Nation* of December 30, 1909 (p. 647 f.), in which I give a list of Poe's publications in *The Flag of Our Union* for 1849.

There are also some errors traceable to careless transcribing. For example, the title of the volume of poems published in 1845, *The Raven and Other Poems*, is twice printed on p. 163 of vol. II with a comma after the second word; on the same page, in the list of contents of this volume, *The Valley of Unrest* and *The City in the Sea* are printed without the initial "The," *The Lake = To —* is printed "The Lake = To —," and two slight errors are made in capitalization. Again in the list of the *Tales* published in the same year (see II, p. 148, note), *A Descent into the Maelstrom* is printed as "The Descent into the Maelstrom," and *The Murders in the Rue Morgue* as "The Murders of the Rue Morgue." The title of "The Murders in the Rue Morgue" is similarly misprinted in a footnote on p. 39, vol. II; and in the same note (as also on p. 404), the publisher of the edition of Poe's tales in 1843 is erroneously given as George B. Zieber; the full title-page of this rare volume—a copy of which is to be found in the Library of Congress—is as follows: *The | Prose Romances of Edgar A. Poe, | Author of "The Gold Bug," "Arthur Gordon Pym," "Tales | of the Grotesque and Arabesque," | Etc. Etc. Etc. | Uniform Serial Edition. | Each Number Complete in Itself. | No. 1. | Containing the | Murders in the Rue Morgue, and the | Man That was Used Up. | Philadelphia: | Published by William H. Graham, | No. 98 Chestnut Street. | 1843. | Price 12 1/2 cents.* Other instances of careless transcribing are to be found in the reproduction of certain of the letters to John Pendleton Kennedy, the originals of which are preserved in the Peabody Library at Baltimore. Collation of Professor Woodberry's text with the originals brings out a number of unimportant errors in punctuation and paragraphing, and also in one case—in the letter of June, 1841, printed in I, pp. 280-282—several errors in phrasing. These are as follows: in the second line, *desire* for *design*; in the fifth line, *send* for *say*; in the eighteenth line on p. 281, *vigorous* for *rigorous*.

Mere typographical errors are more abundant than we should expect in a publication from the "Riverside Press." In the first volume I have detected the following: *Burk* for *Burke* (pp. 25, 29), *Gowan's* for *Gowans's* (p. 257), *xviii* for *xvii*

in the footnote on p. 354, and 141 for 146 on p. 377, l. 23. In the second volume, such errors are more numerous. To be noted first of all are sundry slips in the spelling of proper names. The name of John M. Daniel is spelled *Daniels* no less than seven times (pp. 273, 425, etc.); *Ferguson* appears for *Fergusson* (pp. 443, 463); *Francis* for *Frances* (p. 178); *Lee* for *Lea* (p. 402); *Sargeant* for *Sargent* (pp. 415, 416); *F. W. White* for *T. W. White* (p. 471); *Matthew* for *Mathew* (p. 475); *Stannard* for *Stanard* (p. 478). Other errors are: 1839 for 1838 (p. 401, l. 13); 20 for 21 (p. 404, l. 21); *saw* for *see* (p. 412, l. 21); 1845 for 1835 (p. 414, l. 6); "To — —" for "To — — —" (p. 416, l. 9); *challenge* misspelled (p. 444, l. 33); "Lemonnier" in the index (p. 466) out of alphabetical order; "*The Haunted Chamber* for *The Haunted Palace*," under "Longfellow" (p. 466); *Outes* for *Outis* (p. 469); *Brigg's* for *Briggs's* (p. 473). I have also stumbled upon slight errors or omissions in the page references in the index under "Clarke, Thomas C.," "Mary," "Mystification," "Poe, Rosalie P.," "Wallace, William," and "White, Eliza." But aside from these errors, the mechanical work of the two volumes is thoroughly satisfactory. The index is several times fuller than the index of the first edition. There is also improvement in type, in paper, and in binding. And the photographs, engravings, and facsimiles, with which both volumes are liberally supplied, are done most admirably.

KILLIS CAMPBELL.

The University of Texas.

THE ROMANTIC SCHOOL IN GERMANY.

WERNER, ROBERT M., Ph. D.: *Romanticism and the Romantic School in Germany*. New York and London: D. Appleton and Co., 1910. xv + 373 pp.

Dr. Wernaer has the distinction of having written the first complete English discussion of the German Romantic School. He has studied the sources carefully and has sought, not only to

give the salient features of the School's activities, but to interpret Romanticism as a literary phenomenon in its broader relations to the human spirit. His study is a personal study, written by a man filled with the greatness of the men with whom he has to deal and yet not blinded by their faults; but his interpretation remains always intensely subjective and has all the faults and virtues of such subjectivity.

For him Romanticism is neither a return to the past nor to nature but is a reaction of "Love" against the "Legal" attitude of mind which threatens to shut out from the world the vision of "sweetness and light." From this "Love" all romantic activity proceeded; on the basis of this "Love" all romantic attitudes must be interpreted. The great failure of the book is that it leaves the reader with the suspicion that much of this "Love" proceeds not directly from the School, but from Dr. Wernaer's undeniably poetic interpretation of the Romantic mood and that the glamor within him is reflected in the pages of his work. Instead of keeping a middle course between Haym and Ricarda Huch as the program of his preface indicated, he has substituted for the latter's subjectivity and her theory of the male and female elements in the spirit of the Romantic School and of Goethe, a new theory and a new subjectivity.

For this reason the book will not be entirely clear to the average reader. He will leave it, no doubt, with a keen sense of appreciation of the School and a firm belief in his own Romanticism, but he will not have had a critical survey of the whole. In a way, the book is not elementary enough. It does not contain enough of the bare Grub-grind facts set forth as such. For the specialist, the abandonment of the literary-historical point of departure and the assumption of a new standard offers food for thought. The specialist will not, perhaps, abandon his cherished historical point of view without a struggle, if he abandon it at all, but he must recognize that in this work a definite stand is taken and a real interpretative attempt is made.

There can be no question that the author understands the Romantic School, in spite of a certain naive wonder at it that crops out from time to time. His interpretation of the main problems of

the School is, on the whole, sane and just; his grasp of facts adequate. If he leads everything back somewhat over-enthusiastically to his theory, he at least clothes that theory with a welth of examples that is seductive. For him the Romantic School, and he means by this the first, or Jena group, as opposed to the second, or Heidelberg group, is a band of great leaders who lift life up from barrenness to fertility, whose mission is a revelation of divinity (page 35) and whose failure is the inevitable one to reconcile the irreconcilable, while their victory is to be found in the culmination of the powers of the ego (page 134).

It is not possible in the short space of this review to discuss the book chapter by chapter. Perhaps the harmony of the whole might have been served better if the chapter on Romantic Leaders (Chap. 4) had followed directly after the statement of the problem in Chapter 1.

In the chapter on Romantic nature, Dr. Wernaer has neglected to discuss all the demonism expressed by Tieck in his attitude toward the impinging universe, just as he has omitted all the coloristic effects and the confusion of sense imagery, sight terms for sound and sound terms for light, which was so large a part of the Romantic point of view and which explains so much of the actual seeing and psychology. These two ideas do not follow out the idea of "Love" and it is, perhaps, for this reason that the author has omitted them. The one is a major part of Tieck's personal contribution to the nature attitude of German poetry, the other is one development or faze of the Romantic irony—an attempt to express universality, the oneness of all the non-ego. Nor has Tieck, as Dr. Wernaer claims, the Wordsworthian pantheism. If any distinction is to be made, Tieck's God in Nature must be compared to that of Coleridge and not to Wordsworth's.

The chapter on Romantic irony is one of the clearest in the book. It shows very well the difference in point of view toward this irony as interpreted by Friedrich Schlegel and by Tieck. It might also have been added that the structure of Tieck's dramas like *Der gestiefelte Kater* owes a great deal to certain plays of Ben Jonson and that the clever idea of satire in the play within the play comes as Tieck's personal contribution. The relation of the irony to *Lucinde* is rightly

interpreted but the chapter on that story itself is marred by a certain moral—unctuousness is too strong a word—a certain ministerial tone. Both here and in the chapter on the Romantic lives there seems to be a lurking disapproval with its necessary apologetic tone that appears to have an eye on our latent American Puritanism.

There is, in the last chapter, a good statement of what Romanticism is to us in the present. It has often occurred to the reviewer that America, like Germany, is, tho unconsciously, passing thru a Romantic revival. Some external signs are exhibitions, historical pageants and celebrations. These combined with a new nature attitude, developed first from the English tradition of out-door sport, an attitude that is fostered by a large number of magazines devoted to out-door life, to gardens and to the suburbs, all help on the moral side. They are signs of a new sense of civic righteousness, civic pride and of humanitarianism. Dr. Wernaer points out the same thing from another point of view and leads the modern revival back to his doctrine of "Love."

On the whole, the polemic side of the Romantic School is left too entirely out of the discussion and so the actual condition of the *Aufklärung* with its main exponents is not explained. The whole literary satire, the fact that so large a part of what was written and projected was literarily polemical in character should be brought out in a book for non-Germans. Perhaps here, too, the inclusion would not have fitted in with the doctrine of "Love," tho certainly righteous wrath may arise from love.

A brief word may also be said about the style of the book. The work flows along smoothly, borne on the waves of its author's emotionalism. There are several lapses into cheap colloquialism which a stroke of the pen can eradicate in the revision. So (page 135) "Das Ding an sich, that naughty supernatural background" and others. There are many mixed metaphors. Such translations as "Stormers and Stressers" sound almost ludicrous while the use of the abbreviation Fried. for Friedrich is hardly to be recommended for it smacks of the country newspaper.

Appended to the work is a useful and excellent bibliography. Its plan brings with it some unfortunate repetitions in title because the author has tried to separate source material from critical

works. So, for example, to cite two of a number of instances, Holtei's *300 Briefe*, and Sulzer-Gebing's article on the relation of the Schlegels to art appear several times. A second edition shud rearrange this bibliografy and add some new titles. There is an important letter of Tieck to his sister in the *Festgabe für R. Hildebrand*, Leipzig, 1894. The recent Runge material shud also be added. So, *e. g.*, the studies by Aubert and Roch to which may be joind the most recent, in the *Preussische Jahrbücher* for January, 1910, which appeard since the publication of the book. Karl Lamprecht's outline of the history of Romantic art in volume 10 of his history of Germany is also omitted, as is Gurlitt's history of German art in the nineteenth century, which wud be of interest to the general reader, however much one may take exception to Gurlitt's point of view toward Tieck. Dessauer's study of Wackenroder's relation to Vasari and Ottokar Fischer's article, *Über Verbindung von Farbe und Klang*, in the *Zeitschrift für Aesthetik*, vol. 2 (1907), are also important. Mr. Wernaer probably did not know the latter for he has not made any use of its conclusions, with its general strictures on Steinert's book on Tieck's color sense. Prodnigg's program on the relation of A. W. Schlegel to Lessing touches on a point rather too entirely neglected by the author, namely, the Romantic attitude toward Shaksper, especially Tieck's close personal feeling. In this connection Marie Joachimi-Dege's *Deutsche Shakspeare-Probleme* shud be included. Another noteworthy omission is that of Minor's edition of Novalis.

The following misprints were noted in the bibliografy: page 336, *Geothe*; 338, *Fougué*; 345, *Accorambona*; *Ranftle* for *Ranftl*. The title of his book is *Genoveva als Romantische Dichtung*; 347, *Verhältnisse*.

GEORGE H. DANTON.

Stanford University.

PROVENÇAL ANTHOLOGY.

E. GAUBERT et JULES VÉRAN: *Anthologie de l'Amour Provençal. Préface de J. Anglade.* Paris: Mercure de France, 1909, 315 pp.

The larger part of this book is devoted to selections from Provençal poetry, the original being given as well as the French translation, thus making, for classes in Provençal, an excellent text book. In addition to the poetry itself, a preface of about 30 pages, an Introduction, an Appendix of about 35 pages of close print, and introductory notes at the beginning of each chapter, make of this volume a really scientific tool in the hands of scholars.

Let us lay stress on this part of the book. The Preface is written by J. Anglade, who has just revealed himself an excellent specialist in his *Les Troubadours* (A. Colin, 1908), having absorbed and complemented the science of Diez, Chabaneau, and all their forerunners. He offers us, in those luminous pages, an 'aperçu' of the evolution of the poetry of Provence, or rather of Occitanie as it ought more properly be called (*note* to p. 5). The Troubadours already made love the chief theme of their poetry. But Anglade shows how, because they imagined a love code which represented the lover in the same relation to his lady as the vassal knight to his lord paramount, their literature was impaired by artificiality and lost its meaning when feudal customs lost their grasp upon the people. Anglade then shows how before all was over, the troubadours had, under the pressure of events, transformed their natural, pagan love-songs, into songs of praise in honor of the Queen of Heaven. It would surely prove interesting if one was to compare that evolution with the one of poetry in the North of France, which was first entirely religious in character, and then became profane by freeing itself from the influence of the Church. The Northern transformation was surely more in keeping with the general trend of history, and it seems to the writer that this cause would account very well for the long slumber of the Provençal literature. When he comes to the remarkable awakening at the hands of the modern *félibres*, Anglade hands over his pen to Gaubert and Vérán.

In their Introduction they tell us that a second volume is forthcoming in which other inspirations of Provençal poetry will be taken up; here they deal only with the chief theme, *love*. They maintain the superiority of the *félîtres* over the troubadours, and explain it thus: the troubadours sang for the aristocracy on which they depended for their living; thus, in spite of all the gracefulness and poetry of their verses, there is at the same time a certain lack of spontaneity of personal emotion. The *félître*, on the contrary, is a product of modern democracy [see in Mistral's *Mémoires*, his account of the Revolution of 1848]. Although there have been, and there are still, a few royalist *félîtres*, they all sing really the thoughts, feelings and aspiration of the people, and they themselves belong to the people: "les *félîtres* chantent pour le peuple, et leurs hommages poétiques vont à celle qui passe, aux champs ou dans la rue, n'ayant pour tout diadème que le ruban qui entoure ses cheveux, d'autres richesses que celles dont la nature l'a gratifiée, d'autre science que celle du cœur" (page 29). What further makes their conception of love so deeply human is that they offer in their poems this perfectly inconsistent mixture of paganism and christianity which we all know. The *félître* "a su rester ardent et chaste . . . si la race provençale a gardé tant de jolis gestes païens, si ses yeux ont encore la vision païenne de la nature, elle a l'âme chrétienne: . . . Mireille pourra se mourir d'amour, mais elle mourra pure devant les Saintes-Maries" (p. 30). This explains why this Provençal literature, which could so easily, with the pagan conception of love, become licentious, very rarely is actually so.

The poems, together with the introductory notes, well illustrate the fact that we have here a literature of a very special kind. The poets do not form a class by themselves; they do not consider themselves to be a sort of literary mandarins; they are absolutely one with the people, feel exactly like them, only they know better how to express what is within all. Not to speak of bookdealers like Aubanel, we find among these poets a peasant, a clerk of the P. L. M., a tailor, and even a barber. Furthermore, two of them, d'Arbaud and Baroncelli, who, by right of birth belonged to a higher social class, felt it necessary, in order

to use to the best advantage their gifts as poets, to reënter the ranks of the people, and become *manadié* (éleveurs de taureaux). Not a thing do they sing which is not within the reach of the simple, but poetic, people around them. And they live their poems; how indissolubly connected life and art is can be seen in such biographies as those of Aubanel, the author of the magnificent *Vénus d'Arles*, or of Paul Arène, the author of *La Font-froide*, worthy descendants of that Geofroy Rudel, the troubadour who became the hero of Rostand's *Princesse lointaine*. It is remarkable also that whenever they allow themselves to be touched by poetical themes not specifically Provençal, they first make the subject their own and are not content with mere imitation. Tourès had made Provençal socialism, André and Devolny have created a symbolism of a peculiar kind, and Boissière has even succeeded in writing Provençal poetry while cultivating exotism.

ALBERT SCHINZ.

Bryn Mawr College.

TWO RECENT FRENCH TEXT-BOOKS.

Le Cid, by PIERRE CORNEILLE, edited with introduction, notes, and vocabulary, by JAMES D. BRUNER, Ph. D. New York, Cincinnati, Chicago, 1908, American Book Company.

Ruy Blas, by VICTOR HUGO, edited with introduction, and notes, by KENNETH MCKENZIE. New York, 1909, Henry Holt & Company.

These two works are amongst the most important additions that have been made in recent years to our series of French texts for class-room use, and we may esteem ourselves fortunate that two such able editors should have devoted their talents to the preparation of these standard works, rather than to the production of new texts of minor value.

With his edition of the *Cid*, Professor Bruner sets a new standard in the preparation of classical French texts for school and college use, in that he makes it his first duty to present the work as a piece of literature to be understood and appre-

ciated by the student as such, and not simply as a parcel of language to be opened and sorted into verbs, adjectives and pronouns, each with its corresponding English label. Following the best English usage, there is first of all a comprehensive introduction covering the theory of the classical tragedy in France, its versification, language, style, and setting, together with a discussion of the plot and individual characters of the drama in question. After this preliminary discussion, come a short bibliography and Corneille's *Avertissement* and *Examen*, the whole introduction covering sixty-two pages.

The text is well printed from large type and there is a full vocabulary containing the translation of idiomatic phrases as well as of the individual words. All of this work is done in a thoroughly satisfactory manner, and of itself would be a valuable contribution to our literature on the drama. The editor was not content, however, to rest with a general introduction to direct the student, but devoted his chief attention to the annotation of particular lines and passages, in order that the student might have not only a correct translation of the words and phrases, but also a clear, intelligent conception of the action and motive forces of the dramatic work. The language of a classical writer offers little difficulty to the average student who has been reading for a twelvemonth or so selected passages from nineteenth century authors, and it is always a temptation for both teacher and student alike to be satisfied with a good translation of the text without much thought for its literary value. It is this very tendency that Professor Bruner seeks to overcome, and in his notes to the various scenes he endeavors to point out the part each one plays in the development of the drama as a whole, how it conforms to or departs from the standards of classical composition, whether the rôles of the characters harmonize with the action, and how each character is to be understood. In short, in the footnotes, Professor Bruner gives a valuable analysis of the drama and a literary commentary thereon, such as all instructors should give their classes, but which very few are willing or able to do. As an example of what this commentary is, I will cite the note to Scene v of Act I: "This simple, strong, effective scene, with its animated broken lines, has most artistic-

ally been prepared for by the preceding vigorous situations. An admirable and adequate preparation has, by allusion and stirring action, been made for the introduction of the hero, who appears here for the first time in person. Rodrigue meets at once a severe test of his family loyalty, and, like Ferdinand in Shakespeare's *Tempest*, the young knight 'strangely stood the test.' Corneille has with good taste avoided the barbarism of the Spanish original in which Diègue bites the hand of his son. The melodramatic violence of anger on the part of the mediæval Spanish knight has been toned down to the refined rage belonging to the French courtier of the time of Louis XIII—a justifiable anachronism soon to be more extensively employed by Racine, whose Greek characters are only elegant French gentlemen.

"There is something in the Cid's task of revenge and his adoration of his father that reminds one of the perplexing problems and filial devotion of an Orestes or a Hamlet. The situation recalls, furthermore, the splendid scene in Lope de Vega's *The Star of Seville*, in which the king urges the loyal knight to kill his friend, the brother of the lady he is about to marry."

The emphasizing the literary feature of the notes, the editor has not been unmindful of the linguistic side; attention is regularly called to expressions now obsolete or peculiar to Corneille, and many of the *précieux* terms so common at that time are indicated. The vocabulary fortunately precludes the necessity of translations in the footnotes.

There is little to be said by way of criticism, Professor Bruner does not indicate the text of the drama he followed, but a careful comparison with that of the *Grands Ecrivains* edition,¹ shows but slight variations. Lines 406, Bruner *pas*, G. E. *point*; 584, *soumissions*, G. E. *submissions*; 645, *quelque sentiment*, G. E. plural; 906, *te puis*, G. E. *puis te*; 1094, *la justice*, G. E. *ce monarque*; 1132, *produit*, G. E. *produits*; 1207, *songer*, G. E. *penser*; 1230, *compte*, G. E. *conte*; 1296, *la*, G. E. *leur*; *désir* is regularly accented and *ai* is used instead of *oi* in the terminations of the im-

¹ Edited by Marty-Laveaux, 12 vols., Paris, 1862, Hachette et Cie.

perfect, conditional, etc. Accents are placed on capitals at variance with the best French usage. Unimportant variations in punctuation occur in lines 54, 81, 128, 178, 187, 267, 353, 385, 390, 399, 407, 438, 544, 572, 592, 615, 679, 792, 798, 813, 948, 1019, 1074, 1095, 1168, 1217, 1285, 1360, 1425, 1463, 1466, 1545, 1580, 1661, 1679, 1820. Misprints occur as follows: line 737, *sons* for *son*; 1078, *entends* for *entend*; 1181 and 1624, period for comma; Act V, scene VII, *Don Arias* is omitted from the list of characters. In the note to line 350 the word *death* instead of *insult* is used in referring to Rodrigue's father.

In his treatment of the episode of the Infanta, Professor Bruner insists that it is meant as a comic relief to the intensity of the real action, the writer would not willingly accept this interpretation, preferring to regard the Infanta as one who would sacrifice her inclinations to her position and to her friendship for Chimène. The introduction of such a comic element would not be at all in harmony with the professed ideals of the classic writers.

The task of Professor McKenzie in preparing *Ruy Blas* for class-room use differed considerably from that of Professor Bruner with the *Cid*; it is exceedingly doubtful, in fact, if the two plays could be treated alike, if we were to attempt to indicate fully the feelings and emotions of Hugo's characters, we should undoubtedly far exceed the limits of the college text-book; and furthermore, the characters of the Romantic drama are presented to us in so much greater detail than are the figures in the classical drama that it is certainly an open question whether such extended interpretation is worth while. In the *Cid* comparatively little aid needs to be given to the actual interpretation of the text; the language is classic, the references to outside matters of no account. Quite the contrary is true of *Ruy Blas*; adequate information with regard to the setting and clear explanations of the many unusual words and innumerable historical references is of primary importance to the satisfactory understanding of the drama. The editor has not hesitated to undertake the full responsibility of this interpretation and has spared no pains nor effort in his work.

In a comprehensive introduction, in the almost

incredibly small space of twenty-three pages, he indicates the place of Victor Hugo in the literary development of the early part of the nineteenth century, adding the essential details of his life; he explains the origin and objects of the Romantic movement with especial reference to the drama; he gives a list of the chief plays of that school, including all of Victor Hugo's; he analyzes the character of Ruy Blas, comparing it with that of Hernani; and, finally, he gives a brief picture of the historical conditions in Spain at the end of the seventeenth century. Following the introduction we have the text of the *Préface* and of the drama itself neatly presented, with the stage directions, so important in plays of this sort, printed in type large enough not to fatigue the eye. As there is no vocabulary, the editor has devoted a great deal of attention to the notes which are admirable in every respect. There are very few translations, and the writer has not found a single allusion that needed further elucidation; again, in all cases where there may be a question as to the meaning, the authority is given for the editor's interpretation. Just what Professor McKenzie has added to our knowledge of *Ruy Blas* may best be appreciated by comparing his notes with those of the best preceding edition of the play,—one which has been generally regarded as a most satisfactory piece of work,—when it will be seen that the number of lines annotated is increased by fifty per cent, yet without any useless additions or translations. From his statements and from the number and character of his references, one can see that the editor has left no stone unturned to arrive at accuracy and truth; in fact, it would be hard to find a better guide for the graduate student or the teacher who would make an exhaustive study of the times and drama of Victor Hugo.

MURRAY P. BRUSH.

Johns Hopkins University.

CORRESPONDENCE.

MORE ODD TEXTS OF CHAUCER'S *Troilus*.

To the Editors of *Mod. Lang. Notes*.

SIRS:—I append to this communication copies made by myself from two unnoticed manuscripts, of five stanzas of Chaucer's *Troilus*.

The three "Avaunter" stanzas, taken from *Troilus*, III, 309–322, appear similarly quoted in another ms., Univ. Lib. Camb. Ff. 1. 6, leaf 151. These were printed by Dr. Furnivall, in *Odd Texts*, 1871, App. xi–xii, and are referred to in Miss Hammond's bibliography. The collation with my text shows very slight evidence that the two citations are due to an immediate common original. Thus my copy is an independent testimony to the popularity of these lines in the fifteenth century. Incidentally the Trinity text is to be preferred to its University fellow.

The Pandarus "whetstone" stanza is also quoted elsewhere, in Shirley's ms. R. 3. 20, printed by Dr. Furnivall in the same volume above cited. The odd ascription to Gower is merely another evidence of Shirley's inaccuracy of memory in age. Let no one hint that Chaucer stole the stanza from Gower, and that this was the real cause of the (mythical) Gower-Chaucer feud!

The stanza beginning "If no love is" is another of Shirley's quotations. The old scribe's memory held fast some precious nuggets of verse, according to our modern sense. This Petrarch stanza was never elsewhere quoted, I think.

The Ellesmere Lydgate ms. (No. 4), from which the two stanzas are taken, has only three pages in Shirley's hand on stray leaves at the beginning. Leaf 5b contains in Shirley's most ornate hand

iesu mercy
Margarete & Beaurice
: ma ioye .M. Shirley.

The letter which I give as "M." is the same crowned letter which occurs on the first leaf of Shirley's¹ Ashmole 59, and on p. 363 of his Trin. R. 3. 20. I have no hesitation in declaring with

¹ In his note on Shirley MSS., *Archiv*, CIII, 151. He refers to the Ashmole copy only.

Prof. M. Förster the identity of the letter as "M." Miss Hammond's idea that the letter in the two copies hitherto known is a compound letter MAR, standing either for Maria (*Anglia*, xxvii, 393, n. 1) or for Amor (her latest guess, *Anglia*, xxxiii, 320), is not supported by facts. The letter is identical with other capital "M" initials occurring throughout the Ellesmere ms., save that, as would be natural in an ornamental letter, the faint strokes are firmly drawn in. The fact that the "M" in Trin. R. 3. 20 stands where "A" should come in the line

"A solytarye soore compleynnyng,"

means nothing. If one were to count the number of cases in which initial letters of pieces are wrongly set, he would deserve a pension. Whether the "M" stands for "ma ioye," "mercy," or more probably the crowned Queen "Margarete" of Shirley's later years, is of little account; but future students of "our firste lettre" and of "crowned A" need not trouble themselves with Shirley's fanciful "M."

Folios 2b and 3a of the Ellesmere Lydgate contain:

1. The refrain of Lydgate's "Prayer for King, Queen and People."
2. The first stanza of the Halsham stanzas, beginning "pe worlde so wyde."
3. The second Halsham stanza, here headed "Halsham," beginning "pe more I go."
4. The *Troilus* whetstone stanza, here headed "Gower."
5. The Petrarch stanza, here headed "Troylus."
6. The stanza on the changes in condition from Walton's Boethius, here headed Boese, beginning "As pat pouert causepe sekurnesse."
7. The heading of another stanza, "To yowe Chaucier." On this see Miss Spurgeon's forthcoming note in the Chaucer Allusion Book.

The contents of the Trinity ms. are accessible to all in Dr. James' catalogue. The *Troilus* stanzas are not identified by him however.

(Ellesmere ms. 4, fols. 2b–3a.)

GOWER.

A whetstone is no karving instrument
And yitte it makepe sharpe karving tholis
If þow knowest ought where þat I have miswent

fol. 3a) Eschewe þou þat for suche thing to þe scole is
 þus wyse men beon oft beware by folis
 If þowe do so þy witte is wele bywarded
 By his contrarye is every thing declared—

TROYLUS.

If no love is o lord what fele I so
 And if love is what thing and what is he
 If love be gode fro whens comþe my wo
 If it be wicke gret wonder thenkeþe me
 Sith every turment and adversite
 þat frome it comþe may to me savoury thenke
 For ay thrist I þe more þat I it drynke

BALLADE.

(Ms. Trinity College Cambridge R. 4. 20. 171b.)

O fals tonge so often here byfore
 Has þu made many oon bryghte of hewe
 Say walaway the day that I was bore
 And mony a maydes sorowe for to newe
 And for the more parte all vntrewe
 That men of yelpe and it wer broght to preve
 Of kynde none Avaunter is to leve

Avaunter and a lyer all is oon
 As thus I pose a woman grauntyth me
 Hyr luff and sayth that other wyll she none
 And I am sworne to hold it secre
 And after I go tell it two or thre
 I am avaunter a the leste
 And a lyer for I breke my beheste

No wonder than if thay be not to blame
 Suche maner of folke what I clepe ham what
 That ham avaunte of wymmen and by name
 That neuer yhit behyghte ham this ne that
 Ne knowe ham more than my nowlde hatte
 No wonder is so gode me sende hele
 þoghe wymmen drede with vs men to dele

by me ffraunce.

Collation of this text (T) with Un. Cam. Ff. 1. 6, leaf 150 (F) and with Skeat's text (S). 1 O tonge allas S. 2 many a lady S. 3 seyde S. 5 al is F. S. 9 And thus F a om. F. 10 sayth feythe F. 11 holden S. 12 line om. F. 13 Y-wis I am FS. 14 a om. S. 15 Now loke thanne S now loke thou F. 16 of om. FS. shal I, S. 17 That and, F. 18 knewe, FS.

HENRY NOBLE MACCRACKEN.

Yale University.

POE DOCUMENTS IN THE LIBRARY OF
 CONGRESS.

To the Editors of *Mod. Lang. Notes*.

SIRS:—None of the biographers of Poe have taken account of some interesting documents bearing on the early life of the poet that are

preserved in the Library of Congress. These are, first, a letter of Poe's to George Watterston, Esq., of Washington, D. C., and, second, a number of letters and bills that came to the Library with the purchase of the Ellis-Allan collection of papers.

The Watterston letter—the only one of the documents that was written by Poe—is dated "New York, Nov. 1845," and bears the postmark "New York, Dec. 5." It was written for the purpose of soliciting a subscription for the *Broadway Journal*, which Poe was then editing, and which was in straits. The letter begins with a gracious mention of Mr. Watterston's support of the *Southern Literary Messenger* while Poe was its editor, proceeds with a complimentary allusion to Mr. Watterston as one whose judgment Poe held in high esteem, and ends with the request that he subscribe for the *Journal*. A notation in the lower left-hand corner of this document has it that the manuscript is a facsimile, but the postmark proves it to be an original.

The letters in the Ellis-Allan collection are four in number. Of these the earliest and the most interesting is the letter of Eliza Poe, an aunt of the poet, to Mrs. John Allan, the poet's foster-mother, who is obsequiously addressed as the "Kind Benefactress of the infant Orphan Edgar Allen Poe." The letter was written from Baltimore on February 8, 1813, or when the poet was but four years old. It deals, first, with the failure of Poe's Baltimore grandparents to receive an answer to a letter addressed to Mrs. Allan in July of the preceding year (an omission which the writer suggests was probably due to the miscarriage of the letter); then dwells upon the magnanimity of the Allans in adopting the infant Poe; and concludes with greetings and affectionate messages from Poe's brother, William Henry, his senior by two years. Incidentally reference is made to a meeting of a Mr. Douglas with the Allans at some watering-place, and to Mr. Douglas's report that the boy Edgar Allan was a most handsome and obedient child. The writer of this letter, Eliza Poe, subsequently married Henry Herring, of Baltimore, and her daughter, Elizabeth, was one of the Baltimore cousins whom Poe fell in love with in the early thirties.

The next of the letters in the order of time is

one written by John Allan to Poe's brother, William Henry. This bears the date November 1, 1824. In it Mr. Allan deprecates young Edgar Allan's neglect to answer a letter received from William Henry a short time before, complains of his ward's sulkiness and general ill-temper and his lack of affection for his benefactors, boasts that he had given Poe a better education than he had himself received, compares the two brothers to the disadvantage of the younger, and winds up sanctimoniously with a prayer that God may protect and prosper young William Henry—in order that his sister Rosalie may not suffer. This letter is not an original, but is the copy kept by Mr. Allan.

The two remaining letters have to do with Poe's life at the University of Virginia. One of them is from a school-fellow there, Edward G. Crump, of Dinwiddie Co., Va. It is addressed to Poe, and remonstrates with him for delaying to pay a debt that he owed him—a debt which the writer insists it is all the more his duty to pay since it is not a gambling debt. This letter is dated March 25, 1827,—three months after Poe had left the University. The other letter is from George Spotswood, of Charlottesville, to John Allan, asking that he reimburse him for the services of one of his slaves whom Poe had employed while at the University of Virginia. The date of this letter is May 1, 1827.

The bills in the Ellis-Allan papers are five in all. Four of these are for Poe's tuition at the academy kept by the Clarkes in Richmond—three of them being made payable to J. H. Clarke, and one to J. W. Clarke, apparently a predecessor of J. H. Clarke. The period covered by the first of these bills is June 11 to September 11, 1821; by the second, September 11, 1821, to March 11, 1822; by the third, June 11 to September 11, 1822; by the fourth, September 11 to December 11, 1822. In three of these bills, the item of "Pens, Ink, and Paper" appears, and in one of them charge is made for a Horace and for a Cicero's *De Officiis*. The remaining bill is not against Mr. Allan, but against Poe (spelled *Powe* twice in the document), and for tailor's articles to the amount of \$68.46. Among items included are one "cut velvet vest," one "pair Drab Pantalons and Trimmings," one "Set Best Gilt Buttons," and three yards of "Linin," with a like amount of "Super Blue Cloth." The bill is not dated, but probably belongs to Poe's college period.

KILLIS CAMPBELL.

The University of Texas.

PALAESTRA, LXXXIV.

To the Editors of Mod. Lang. Notes.

SIRS :—The filosofical basis of Novalis' esthetic theories is the subject of volume 84 of *Palaestra* (E. Havenstein, *Friedrich von Hardenbergs ästhetische Anschauungen*, Berlin, 1909). The book contains many new and stimulating theories especially with regard to Novalis' relation to Fichte, who, according to Havenstein, had by no means as much influence in determining the content of Novalis' ideas as is generally supposed. It is rather to Hemsterhuis that one must look for the fundaments of the Romantic filosofical system. The great significance of Hemsterhuis in the development of Romantic thinking in Germany has long been known but it has remained for Havenstein and Kircher in his recent brilliant study of the filosofy of the Romantic School in Germany to bring out the details.

Not only did Novalis not really accept Fichte's doctrine of the difference between the *ich* and the *nicht-ich*, but he did not even thoroly digest Fichte's general doctriens as the notes from his Fichtean reading clearly show. For Novalis, the barrier between the *ich* and the *nicht-ich* does not exist and all filosofising is self-contemplation without any reference to the external ego. The difference between the two egos is non-existent or at least if it must be predicated, according to Novalis' scheme, it can also be overcome. From this point of view it is an easy step to the Romantic doctrine of *Willkür* and of the miraculous as parts of the inner world of fancy. Hence too, Novalis' glorification of mathematics as the highest form of this *Willkür*.

The ultimate basis of reality is in the feelings alone and these with the unconditioned freedom of the imagination are the material and birthright of the Romantic personality. The poet and the filosofer are two parts of the same thing. The poet takes his material and treats it inwardly but absolutely independently (*Pluspoesie*) the filosofer treats it objectively.

The book also discusses Novalis' theory of the "Märchen," of transcendental poetry, and gives a definition of "romantic" from Novalis' point of view without adding much to the subject. Prefix to the discussion of the esthetic theories is a very important attempt at a redating and rearrangement of the Fragments. Havenstein shows three periods in Novalis' chirography and arranges the Fragments accordingly. This arrangement will prove a definitiv check on Heilborn's edition which has already been so sharply criticized by Walzel and Minor.

GEORGE H. DANTON.

Stanford University.